REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 414 24
HIGH SCHOOL DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH--THEIR ORGANIZATION, ADMINISTRATION, AND SUPERVISION.
BY- SQUIRE, JAMES R. AND OTHERS
ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA
REPORT NUMBER CRP-F-047 PUB DATE 64
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$6.92 173P.

DESCRIPTORS- HIGH SCHOOL ORGANIZATION, *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, TEACHER EVALUATION, *TEACHER SUPERVISION, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, *CONFERENCES, *DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS (SCHOOL), INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, URBANA, ILLINOIS

PROMINENT HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CHAIRMEN AND CONSULTANTS AT TWO CONFERENCES AGREED UPON A STATEMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE ENGLISH CHAIRMAN WHICH STRESSED THE CHAIRMAN AS A SUBJECT SPECIALIST WITHIN THE SCHOOL WHO IS ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY FOR COORDINATING INSTRUCTION. FOURTEEN PAPERS WERE PREPARED FOR THE FIRST 3-DAY CONFERENCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS IN OCTOBER 1964. DISCUSSION OF THESE PAPERS BY THE 18 PARTICIPANTS RESULTED IN 30 RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH WERE REVIEWED AT A SECOND 1-DAY CONFERENCE BY 60 SELECTED HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CHAIRMEN IN CLEVELAND, OHIO, IN NOVEMBER, 1964. THE PARTICIPANTS IN BOTH CONFERENCES ALSO PREPARED A DETAILED LIST OF MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, SUPPLEMENTARY BOOKS, REFERENCE BOOKS, GENERAL EQUIPMENT, AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT NEEDED BY ENGLISH CLASSROOMS AND DEPARTMENTS. IN ADDITION, PARTICIPANTS AGREED ON 23 FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE AREAS OF (1) ENGLISH DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION, (2) CURRICULUM, (3) SUPERVISION, (4) TEACHER SELECTION AND ASSIGNMENT, (5) TEACHER EDUCATION, AND (6) PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH. (JM)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

HIGH SCHOOL DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH: THEIR ORGANIZATION, ADMINISTRATION, AND SUPERVISION

A Report of the Urbana and Cleveland Conferences
October–November, 1964

The conferences reported herein were held by the
University of Illinois
under a contract with the
United States Office of Education,
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
under provisions of the
Cooperative Research Program.

James R. Squire, Director
Roger K. Applebee, Associate Director
Robert J. Lacampagne, Editor

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
508 South Sixth Street **Champaign, Illinois 61822**

ED 003414

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

James R. Squire, NCTE Executive Secretary, *Chairman*
Frank Ross, Oakland County Schools, Pontiac, Michigan
Glenn Leggett, University of Washington
Virginia M. Reid, Oakland Public Schools, California
Enid M. Olson, NCTE Director of Publications

CONSULTANTS FOR THE URBANA OR CLEVELAND CONFERENCES
ON
HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS

ROBERT A. BENNETT, San Diego City Schools, California
RICHARD CORBIN, Hunter College High School, New York
LOU L. LABRANT, Dillard University
HENRY C. MECKEL, San Jose State College
FLOYD RINKER, Commission on English, College Entrance Examination Board
LEO P. RUTH, University of California, Berkeley
NICHOLAS SCHREIBER, Ann Arbor High School, Michigan

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction vii

I. THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN . 1

A. The National Study and High School English Chairmen, James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee 3

B. The High School Department Chairman, A Description of Responsibilities 7

II. RECOMMENDATIONS 11

A. Organizing the Department (Recommendations 1-4) . . 13

B. Curriculum (Recommendations 5-9) 17

C. Teacher Selection and Assignment (Recommendations 10-13) 23

D. Teacher Education (Recommendations 14-18) . . . 26

E. Supervision (Recommendations 19-21) 30

F. Public Attitudes toward English (Recommendations 22, 23) 32

G. Areas of Discussion and Controversy 34

III. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN 39

A. Establishing, Developing, and Evaluating an English Program

1. "Organizing the English Department for Effective Instruction," Jean L. B. Christison . . . 42

2. "The Role of the Department Chairman in Curriculum Development," Josephine Martin 48

3. "The Chairman's Role in Selecting Textbooks and Library Books," Nell H. Thomas 54

4. "Disseminating Results of New Research in English," Frank M. Rice 59

5. "The Role of the Chairman in Evaluating the Program and in Maintaining Sequence," Clarence W. Hach . 63

B. Selecting, Training, and Supervising the English Staff

1. "The English Department Chairman's Role in Recruiting and Selecting Teachers," Travis E. Harris . . . 74

2. "Helping Beginning Teachers and Inadequately Prepared Teachers," Margaret Casey 78

3. "The Chairman's Role in Inservice Education," William M. See 85

4. "The Supervision of English Teaching," Mabel M. Brown 92

C. Articulation and Responsibilities outside the English Department

1. "English Departments in Relation to Other Departments," Ruth B. Herin 100

2. "Articulation with Junior High School English Programs," Evelyn Copeland 108

D. Special Reports and Commentary

1. "The Chairman in Relation to Administrators and Supervisors," Charles B. Ruggless 118

2. "Implications of the USOE Conference of Supervisors of English for High School English Departments," Sue M. Brett 124

3. "Cooperation between Secondary Schools and Colleges," Robert W. Rogers 129

APPENDICES 137

A. Recommendations for the High School English Classroom 138

B. Recommendations for the High School Departmental English Center 143

C. Citizen's Request for Reconsideration of a Book . . . 157

D. Participants at the Conferences 159

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the proceedings and recommendations of two national conferences in 1964 on the Organization, Administration, and Supervision of High School Departments of English. These conferences were supported by the Cooperative Research Division of the United States Office of Education, administered by the University of Illinois, and cosponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English. The conferences brought together outstanding high school English department chairmen to examine problems and to formulate recommendations concerning effective practices in organizing, administering, and supervising English departments in high schools.

The practices considered at the conferences were identified in the course of the National Study of High School English Programs, Cooperative Research Project No. 1994. During the first year of this project, studies of almost 100 selected schools revealed much variation in the responsibilities assigned to department chairmen. Differences were found in such areas as evaluation of instruction, development of curriculum, dissemination of information about research and new developments in English, and related concerns directly affecting the quality of English teaching.

Seventeen high school English chairmen and specialists in English education participated in the initial three-day conference at the University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, October 15-17, 1964. Prior to this meeting twelve participants prepared papers discussing in detail special problems in organizing and supervising high school English departments. Subsequently, these papers were duplicated and sent to each participant for review. In every case, a formal response to the position represented by the writer was prepared by two or more participants. In addition, three special presentations were made at the conference: a summary of significant findings thus far identified in Project No. 1994, prepared by the Project Staff, a discussion of the implications of a national conference on Supervision in English by Sue Brett, Specialist in English, U. S. Office of Education, and a discussion of ways in which high school and college English departments can work closely together by Robert W. Rogers, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, University of Illinois.

Members of the Urbana conference devoted much time to formulating preliminary recommendations for organizing and administering high school departments of English. Selected papers and major recommendations were then prepared for the national invitational conference of English department chairmen in Cleveland, Ohio, November 25, 1964, immediately preceding the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English. Chairmen of all 116 schools participating in the National Study of High School English Programs received invitations to attend this conference. General recommendations from the three-day conference were first presented in general session and then discussed in group sessions throughout the day. The group's final recommendations appear in Part II of this report.

For assistance in reading the final manuscript and making helpful suggestions, we are grateful to those chairmen who attended the Urbana conference. For additional assistance in editing we are particularly indebted to Enid M. Olson, Robert F. Hogan, Jon Corbin, Mary Vander Hart, and other members of the staff of the National Council of Teachers of English. Robert Lucas and Joseph Thomson offered valuable suggestions, and in their work on the National Study of High School English Programs contributed much data to support the recommendations presented here. Mrs. Bobby Lark Wilson supervised not only the arrangements for the two conferences but also the final typing of the manuscript.

In a majority of American high schools, the department chairman is the only subject specialist assigned any responsibility for coordinating instruction in English. Consequently, the effectiveness of his leadership influences directly the quality of that instruction. The two conferences were called to define, discuss, and recommend ways of strengthening the leadership role of a high school English department chairman.

The publication of these proceedings will help to define the department chairman's proper function in high schools throughout the country. Where the accompanying recommendations are implemented in individual school systems, English programs will be strengthened and the academic promise of every high school will be enhanced.

J. R. S.
R. K. A.
R. J. L.

PART I

The High School English Department Chairman

THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

"The National Study and High School English Chairmen" is a paper prepared by members of the staff of the National Study of High School English Programs to explain how the conferences on the Organization, Administration, and Supervision of High School Departments of English were an outgrowth of the larger National Study. One of the most significant observations in the National Study was the need for effective and inspirational leadership on the part of the department chairman. Without this leadership, badly needed changes in the organization, administration, and supervision of English departments were unlikely to occur. The first paper then is directed to the need for evaluating the role of an English department chairman in light of the overall findings of the National Study.

"The High School Department Chairman, A Description of Responsibilities" summarizes the role of the department chairman as envisioned in this overall report. This descriptive profile of an English department chairman resulted from the recommendations of the three-day conference in Urbana, Illinois. This profile was reinforced by the recommendations approved at the second conference in Cleveland.

The National Study and High School English Chairmen

James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee

The National Study of High School English Programs started as an investigation of practices in English teaching characteristic of high schools known to be achieving important results in English. To a considerable extent this central purpose remains. But increasingly as staff members traveled through 45 states to the more than 100 separate schools visited at the time of the conferences, they found the study becoming more and more a national report and assessment of the current state of English teaching—its state at least in schools with student bodies in excess of four or five hundred pupils.

The National Study's procedures for selecting institutions, as well as internal data on these schools collected during the investigation, convince us that these schools do indeed represent the better high school English instruction in this country. We do not claim to have all the outstanding departments in the study, but we do have many of the best. And if the quality of instruction observed by the staff seems at times not quite good enough, one has only to imagine what may be characteristic of many practices in unselected high school English programs.

Multiple criteria were used to winnow the 116 schools participating in the study from the 26,000 in the United States. Considered were such matters as the success of high school graduates in English, the number and consistency of NCTE Achievement Award winners, the number of Merit Award students, the reputation of the school's English department in nearby colleges and in state departments of education; in short, all the formal and informal evidence available to identify those schools which seemed to be doing excellent work in English with college-bound students. Regrettably, staff members found no index for suggesting success with noncollege students, but did not, nevertheless, restrict attention to college preparatory programs.

The preliminary screening accomplished, the Project then invited schools to participate and considered a number of variables in the final screening: the percentage of students going on to college (from 10 percent to 95 percent in our study); the degree of financial support and annual expenditures per pupil (from less than $300 to more than $1200); urban, suburban, or small town location; salary schedules of teachers; socioeconomic variation in the community. A good sampling of each variable is found among the schools in the original study. Regrettably, during the first year, the staff could not visit independent schools, but a supplementary grant now permits the inclusion of selected independent and Catholic schools, selected large city comprehensive high schools (too few of which appeared in the original study), and a number of schools engaged in experimental English programs. Each school visit is conducted by qualified professors of English and education and members of the Project and NCTE staffs.

These schools are different from the usual high schools. Over 70 percent of the English teachers report majors in the subject, compared to little more than 50 percent of 7-12th grade teachers of English nationally. The teachers, also, express different needs. When asked to specify the college courses in which they would be most interested in enrolling, the majority of teachers in schools visited list literary criticism, intermediate and advanced composition, and close studies of authors and periods in that order of priority. To a similar question, a sampling of all national English teachers expressed an overwhelming preference for work in methods of instruction. The internal evidence in the study alone indicates that these schools are indeed repesentative of good secondary education today. Some 52.4 percent of the teachers hold membership in the National Council of Teachers of English; 83.5 percent regularly read the *English Journal* and 30.2 percent *College English* as well; almost half have earned at least one advanced degree since beginning full-time teaching, in addition to the 13.7 percent who held such a degree when they began to teach. All these data are substantially higher than reported in English surveys nationally and indicate that the teachers in these schools are unusually well prepared.

The data on the teaching of English accumulated through observation, interview, and questionnaire are now being compiled and studied. The National Council of Teachers of English will publish a full report shortly after the completion of the study in December, 1965. To discuss preliminary findings would be premature, except as such findings seem to illuminate particular problems in organizing, administering, and supervising high school English programs. Those preliminary findings which relate to the deliberations of the conferences are presented separately in the text of the report which follows. From the beginning of the National Study, however, staff members were aware of great variation in the supervision and administration of high school English programs and of ways in which the organization of school programs seemed to affect the quality of instruction.

Interviews with more than 300 teachers of English, some identified as particularly "gifted" or "outstanding" by their supervisors and administrators, yielded valuable information. One indication of the success of visiting teams in selecting teachers to interview is suggested by the overwhelming zest of these teachers for classroom work, for experiences with young people, and for progress in English. But despite the strong professional attitude of this group, basic concerns were repeatedly expressed, many regarding the low morale of English teachers in the schools. Teachers reported a lack of sympathy, lack of support, and lack of interest in English on the part of administrators, school boards, the public, and sometimes even the students. Concern about the wear and tear of paper correction, about capricious administrative directions, about impossibly heavy pupil load—these issues seem most on teachers' minds. Teachers complain of their isolation from fellow faculty members—even those in English. They too seldom have an opportunity to exchange ideas about literature, language, and composition with their colleagues.

Released time for department chairmen in these schools averages two periods out of a six period day. These chairmen average about $250 extra in compensation, although several receive extra stipends of $3,000 or more. About 25 percent are appointed for a specific length of time, i.e., almost three quarters serve at the pleasure of the principal—or perhaps are permanent "career" appointments.

Of their major responsibilities, the chairmen rate first, "to service the department." "Helping new teachers" and "establishing and revising the curriculum" are mentioned second and third. Fewer than 20 percent of these department heads admit any responsibility for holding conferences with other teachers and administrators.

These data find support elsewhere in the study and offer one reason for the urgency and importance of the conferences reported here. Not more than a fourth of the administrators in our schools see the department chairman playing an important role in evaluating and improving instruction, as judged from actual delegation of responsibility. Yet the evidence indicates that instruction in English needs careful scrutiny by a specialist. Emphasizing the critical position of the subject matter chairman, Theodore R. Sizer, Dean of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, stated: "The crucial man in the secondary school—and, if specialization in the best sense extends to elementary schools, there as well—is the department chairman, and teacher training institutions must look much more carefully than heretofore at his training and his role. Ironically, the autonomy of the individual teacher is best protected by developing a corps of first rate senior school men who as leaders can both tie the hands of the inept and free the bonds of the master."[1]

Department chairmen too often underestimate their potential influence. We know that many individuals learn to teach by emulating the qualities of those whom they admire. Indeed it is the danger here which continually leads teacher educators to warn young teachers against too ready an imitation of their graduate professors. As staff members interviewed more than 300 teachers, they sought information on the factors or experiences or people most responsible for the ways in which they taught. To the surprise of those interviewers, it was neither the great book nor the great scholar that was mentioned first by many of the best teachers in our programs, but rather specialists in the teaching of English: the methods instructor, perhaps; the critic teacher during supervised teaching; the department chairman during those first formative years in the classroom. Clearly, department chairmen can do much to upgrade the quality of teaching if they will provide better student teaching conditions or work out better ways of meeting regularly with beginning teachers of English. Perhaps a chairman faced with more than one or two new teachers should arrange from the first for some continuing seminar on the problems of teaching led by the chairman himself.

---

[1] "Classroom Revolution: Reform Movement or Panacea?" *Saturday Review*, June 19, 1965, p. 54.

These then are a few of the facts and feelings leading to the calling of these conferences. Perhaps no greater variation has been found in the National Study than variation in the organization, administration, and supervision of the English departments themselves. Most of us on the Project Teams are convinced that the promise of today's new English programs can be realized only through new approaches to administration and supervision. Good as are many of the things that we have seen in this study, they simply are not good enough. We find teachers who need support and are simply not obtaining it. We find department chairmen who know what they need to do faced with conditions preventing action. The present system is not working; indeed past accomplishments are a wonder in the light of the present. They represent a monumental triumph of individuals over the system.

We are convinced that if the profession speaks out—directly, firmly, realistically, imaginatively, boldly, above all boldly—American education will listen. The Urbana and Cleveland conferences were called to make recommendations at a time when many of us expect to see a massive reappraisal and reorganization of the administrative and supervisory structures of our schools. The need is manifest. The time is now.

The High School English Department Chairman, A Description of Responsibilities

The following statement, describing the role and responsibilities of the English department chairman, emerged from the papers and discussions at the Urbana conference. Participants agreed that a basic, but general, description—with which they could concur—would be a necessary background for the more concrete recommendations concerning particular aspects of school and department policy. At the suggestion of participants at both conferences, the statement has since been augmented and modified. Consequently, it represents a basic philosophical consensus of the conferences—a reasonable donnée regarding the function of the chairman of a high school English department.

From either a practical or a theoretical point of view, the single most important reason for appointing an English department chairman in the secondary school is to improve instruction. Therefore, considerations of years in service, personal friendship, or immediate convenience should give way to the professional and intellectual competence that the chairman can bring to the many-faceted role that he must play as department leader. On the one hand, he must provide vigorous intellectual leadership pervading the department and other reaches of his school as well. That he must himself be a teacher of stature who is willing to demonstrate his ability as opportunities are available is obvious; but he should also reveal a more than common knowledge of his subject and extend this knowledge by a continuing study of English and of research in the teaching of English. In part, this commitment to his profession can be fostered by continuous activity in professional organizations; in part, it is served by his individual efforts to learn and disseminate the promising ideas to be found in journals, in professional literature, or in other schools. On the other hand, the department chairman is responsible for creating a favorable climate for learning by working with teachers and administrators to give English teachers time to teach. By promoting within the department an atmosphere of mutual respect (tempered, however, with the opportunity for mutual criticism), by encouraging the exchange of ideas, and by guarding against an excess of clerical and administrative impedimenta, he will hopefully achieve the necessary climate for effective teaching and learning.

Granted then, that the department chairman has the intellectual vigor, the stamina, and the personal qualities to create such an atmosphere, what are his responsibilities and duties? Although many of his functions are difficult to circumscribe precisely, and although the size and organization of each school is unique, it may be helpful to think of his responsibilities in four major areas—understanding that the categories are frequently arbitrary and that the particular responsibilities listed under one may carry over to other categories. These areas are (1) procedural details, (2) supervision, appointment, and evaluation of teachers, (3) curriculum development, and (4) public relations.

1. PROCEDURAL DETAILS

Obviously the first area is related to all of the others and seems, at first, of slight consequence to the chairman's proper function. Yet ability to set procedure and to handle details is essential; only if a chairman can manage the routines of office can he free himself for more important responsibilities. By abdicating a responsibility to draw the departmental budget, he narrows the effectiveness of his teachers by limiting the books and equipment they might have had. By failing to participate in student registration and grouping procedures, he puts fetters on the English curriculum. A resourceful chairman can avoid a complexity of minor problems by working with his teachers to develop guidelines dealing with everything from supplying books and films to establishing criteria for correcting themes. A competent department chairman employs vision, but also procedure, in planning meaningful department meetings and curriculum studies.

2. SUPERVISION, APPOINTMENT, AND EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

If a department chairman is to be responsible for the quality of English instruction in his school, he must be involved in the appointment, supervision, and evaluation of English teachers. Although large school districts must use centralized offices and personnel specialists to cope with the plight of too few teachers and too many classrooms, the chairman should still advise in hiring new teachers. At best, he is a party to the recruiting and interviewing of prospective teachers before they are employed. As the one who best knows the needs of his department, he is in a position to recommend the most qualified replacement or addition. Knowing the appointee in advance, he can start orientation long before the opening day of school.

The chairman is likewise in the most favorable position to know the inadequacies of other teachers on the English staff and can therefore counsel them as to the kinds of inservice training which would be most helpful. By the same token, he knows best the unique strengths of his department members and finds ways to make these resources available to others. He struggles, for example, to encourage the creative teacher to experiment with new procedures and new content, without sacrificing instructional goals required for program continuity. He listens carefully to those who have new ideas to present and encourages careful departmental consideration of every new idea, no matter how unpopular it may initially seem. He can recommend to local colleges and universities the kinds of courses that would be especially useful to a group of teachers, or the kinds of workshops or institutes that would benefit an entire department. He can call to the attention of college or district authorities those teachers in the department who have unusual talents which could contribute to workshops or special meetings. As an agent of liaison within the school, the chairman also serves as intermediary among his teachers, the guidance department, and the administration. In this capacity he can, for example, help teachers interpret standardized test scores, win administrative support for a department project, or suggest that a teacher use one of the auxiliary student services in handling a unique problem.

Implicit in this liaison position is the chairman's role in teacher evaluation. Whether such evaluation means dismissal, tenure, or an additional salary increment, the teacher has a right to expect that the person who is most knowledgeable about him, his subject, and the varieties of teaching methods open to him should judge his competence. Although the school principal can judge in part and, in larger districts, the subject matter specialist can judge in part, the department chairman is probably most highly qualified to weigh all parts. However, if the burden of teacher evaluation is to be borne by the chairman, it seems axiomatic that he should have opportunity and authority for classroom visitation—not once or twice, and not capriciously—but to the extent that he can render a professional judgment concerning the effectiveness of a teacher. Such visitation, of course, demands that he be given the necessary time for observing classes and for holding conferences with teachers following each visit. Certainly for new teachers the visit and the conference supply the best possible method for inservice education and the consequent improvement of teacher effectiveness. The chairman's intimate knowledge of each teacher's strengths, of course, enables the chairman to write the overall English schedule, deploying each teacher to the grade levels and ability groups where he can be most successful. It also assists him in advising teachers about instructional matters or in supporting those creative teachers who seek to experiment with new approaches or new content.

In working with teachers in his department, the chairman has one special obligation to the future of English teaching, the responsibility of identifying, encouraging, and educating one or two vigorous, creative young teachers who may someday serve as English chairmen on their own. Indeed given the present turnover on many school faculties and the rate at which new schools are being constructed, each chairman may seriously accept the obligation to be preparing at all times at least two potential chairmen, one for his own school and one for some newly created department elsewhere.

3. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Any effort towards improving the curriculum or developing a new course of study rests on the assumption that the subject content or sequence might be changed. It is obvious then that a chairman's primary responsibility in the area of curriculum is the continuing assessment of its strengths and weaknesses. Such an evaluation suggests that he know what happens, not only during the three or four years of high school English, but in the years before and after—in the English programs of contributing elementary and junior high schools and in those local colleges and universities where the majority of college-bound students will go. An understanding of these programs and a knowledge of new developments in subject matter and method allow the chairman, in association with his fellow teachers, to make intelligent decisions concerning curriculum change. For the most part, he asserts an oblique influence on curriculum by working with fellow teachers in selecting books, in preparing suggestive guides for teaching particular works of literature, in outlining special approaches to teaching language or composition. Large scale or districtwide curriculum renovation would clearly demand not only his talent and the contribution of many teachers, but the unique knowledge and authority of the district supervisor and the assistance of the college specialist as well.

Besides providing a means of articulation between the high school, the college, and the elementary school English programs, the English department chairman must work closely with chairmen of other subject areas to avoid the problems of repetition or conflicting instruction and to promote a healthy reinforcement and extension of ideas and skills.

4. PUBLIC RELATIONS

One avenue of school and college articulation already present in many secondary schools is the practice of using high school classes as a training ground for future teachers. A capable chairman accepts the responsibility of placing these interns with helpful and competent teachers and he also cooperates with the college instructors in evaluation. There are many bonuses: promising candidates may be singled out as future staff members; lines of communication between the school and the college stay open; fresh viewpoints are obtained; good relationships with the local college are enhanced.

A decidedly important function of the English chairman is in this very area of public relations—or more specifically, public attitudes toward English and English teaching. An open door policy is not enough. To dispel the common public notion that English is nothing more than an accumulation of rules regarding spelling and verbal niceties, the department chairman should interpret the program to administrators, parents, and the public at large. Resolute and intelligent interpretation raises the public image of the teaching of English and provides a sympathetic background for improvement of the profession.

PART II

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATIONS

A series of recommendations concerning the organization, administration, and supervision of high school English programs was proposed at the conclusion of the three-day Urbana conference. These recommendations were then presented to the participants at the Cleveland conference of English department chairmen where the recommendations were discussed further and, in some cases, revised.

The recommendations as a whole reflect the new image of the role of a department chairman presented in Part I. Taken separately, however, they lack validity. For example, if the title, Chairman, English Department, is largely an honorary title, the recommendation that a chairman be given a reduced class load and clerical assistance is obviously unnecessary. If he is given a role encompassing the following recommendations, however, additional time and assistance will be necessary.

These recommendations obviously foresee a radical departure from the accepted administrative and supervisory responsibilities of an English department chairman. Even the conferees felt that the multiplicity of roles was almost too much to expect from one person. But then this comment could be made about any position of importance.

Organizing the Department

Recommendation No. 1: Every department should have an English Center to house its professional library, its special textbook and teaching material collection, its file of end-of-the-year examinations, its audiovisual equipment, and its workspace for teachers.

Local conditions dictate the size and location of an English Center. Such a center in a small high school of two or three English teachers may be located in the school library or even in a corner of the department chairman's room. A large school district may choose to house such a professional library in one central location. The effectiveness of this arrangement, however, can be judged only by the use teachers make of the library. Observation by the staff of the National Study suggests that the greater the distance between English classroom and resource center, the less the resources are used.

Ideally, each school should maintain a separate area for an English Center. Space should be available for English teachers to discuss curriculum matters and mutual problems, read professional magazines and books, and prepare class work. Many advantages will accrue to the department that has provided such a center —among them, the casual but frequent exchange of ideas, psychological support from talking with colleagues, and the immediate help that a chairman can give to individuals under these conditions.

The professional library in an English Center need not be large. After establishing such a library, a small school that purchased only eight or ten important hardbound books annually plus a selection of other publications and magazines would go far in keeping the library up-to-date on the current literature in English. Purchases for a professionally active department would be far greater. A basic list of books, pamphlets, periodicals, and equipment needed for such an English Center appears in the Appendix. (See Appendix B for specific recommendations for equipping the English Center. See also discussion by Christison, p. 42.)

Recommendation No. 2: Room libraries of approximately 500 selected books, many of them paperbacks, should be provided for every English classroom.

No one in education would think of equipping a woodshop without tools or a physics laboratory without science equipment. Yet English classrooms frequently lack their most important tool—books. Although most high schools have libraries, these libraries are often unavailable to students during the day and close almost immediately at the end of the school day. If, as the profession agrees, a greater emphasis should be placed on reading, and particularly on individualized reading, then a classroom book collection seems indispensable. For wide individual reading, nothing can replace its immediate effectiveness. When a student becomes interested in Hemingway, Conrad, or Chekhov as a result of reading a short story in the class text, nothing is quite as effective as the teacher's taking a book by the same author from his class shelves and saying "Here, why don't you read this book by ——?" Room libraries are particularly useful in extending the choice and raising the level of reading for all students, whether sophisticated or reluctant readers. In schools with extensive classroom libraries, carefully used, the Project Staff observed increased reading by pupils and greater circulation in the central library.

Although 500 books are suggested in this recommendation, the individual classroom situation may dictate more or fewer books per room. Such book collections may be part of the new laboratory rooms or learning centers designed for English instruction which are beginning to appear in redesigned high schools. Sometimes separate rooms and separate book collections are provided for college-bound and noncollege students. Providing for book collections in this way is effective only if each student is assigned several laboratory periods per week and if the learning center is readily accessible to the student. In discussing the recommendation of classroom collections in Cleveland, conferees suggested that many of these classroom books be paperbacks but that some of them be especially attractive hardcover editions.

The conferees raised some question about administrative and clerical difficulties involved in maintaining a classroom book collection. But such problems have been and can be resolved by teachers. Certain losses in any library are inevitable; with the use of paperbacks, such losses need not be expensive. Because of student donations, some classroom libraries actually contain more books at the end of the year than at the beginning. One principal recently estimated that a modest classroom paperback library of 100 volumes could be established for as little as $100 and maintained for $40 annually—a slight sum indeed considering its potential educational value.

This recommendation in no way suggests a lessening influence of a central school library. The school librarian should assist the English teacher in selecting and ordering books and may wish to maintain a central catalog of the books charged to each room. Some librarians wish to rotate collections every six to eight weeks. Conferees felt that increasing class reading would result in greater demands on the school library, for members of the Project Staff and the conferees have observed that class libraries, paperback clubs, and bookstores *increase* the use of the school library, not decrease it. (See Appendix A for recommendations on the English classroom. See also discussion by Thomas, p. 54.)

Recommendation No. 3: In large departments (fifteen or more teachers), grade level representatives should be appointed for the year to serve with the chairman as a steering committee concerned with

> **books, materials, and curricular matters; and such teachers should be given common preparation periods and released time for meetings.**

Articulation within the school and cohesiveness in the curriculum become increasingly difficult as the size of a department increases. Although the provisions of this recommendation would be useful in a department smaller than fifteen teachers, the conferees agreed that such a plan is vital in a large department. Without such department coordination, efforts at articulation are likely to fail.

A key part of the recommendation is a common planning period for grade level chairmen. Quite apart from this desirable provision is the possibility of a common preparation period for all teachers involved in teaching the same grade. Teachers with similar instructional problems need opportunity to consider issues together. If the voice of each teacher is to be heard in discussing key problems facing the department, opportunity for exchanging ideas must be provided. The teachers' right to dissent to any curricular decision is a meaningful right only if opportunities are provided for carefully considering each teacher's point of view. Those who have worked on team teaching projects know that the necessary cooperative study and discussion occur only as teachers regularly meet together. (See discussions by Thomas, p. 54; by Christison, p. 42.)

> **Recommendation No. 4:** Every English department should be given part-time professional clerical help and in a large department (fifteen or more teachers) full-time clerical help should be available.

The responsibilities of a department chairman as recommended in this report will involve more paper work than department chairmen now have. Even with released time, his responsibilities should not include typing letters, reports, and book orders, mimeographing, cataloging, and the myriad of other clerical tasks that so often fall to the chairman. Just as some schools have found excellent persons in the community to work as lay readers, some English departments have found well-educated persons, often housewives, willing to do part-time secretarial work. There is a trend toward reduced pupil loads in English. Nevertheless, a substantial drop in class size nationally is not imminent. As a result, clerical help can be useful not only to the chairman, but also to members of the department. A competent secretary or clerk can do much of the nonprofessional work now done by English teachers, thereby freeing these teachers to spend more time on study, theme correction, and class preparation. The staff of the National Study reports that one frequent criticism voiced by hundreds of English teachers throughout the country is the inordinate time required for routine clerical duties; even in these selected schools such duties consume at least four hours per teacher each week, and much additional time is spent preparing teaching materials which could be assigned to nonprofessional help.

Under these circumstances and in the absence of any immediate reduction of pupil load, the conferees recommended extending the above provision for clerical assistance to one assistant for each six or seven teachers. (See discussion by Christison, p. 42; Copeland, p. 108).

Curriculum

Recommendation No. 5: All teachers should be involved in discussing the philosophical issues underlying curricular decisions, but the responsibility for writing guides and preparing materials evolved from these decisions should be assigned to a few teachers who are given released time for this additional work or, preferably, compensatory pay for work during periods when the school is not in session.

Teachers should understand and support the philosophical issues underlying curricular decisions. In large school districts, the preliminary involvement of all teachers in discussing curricular decisions is a formidable task. Yet such participation is not only possible but necessary if the curriculum decided upon is actually to affect instruction.

This recommendation does not suggest that persons other than the teachers should not participate in curricular decisions. A combination of college and university subject area specialists, curriculum specialists, subject supervisors, school administrators and qualified teachers is likely to produce the best curriculum. Members of the Cleveland conference recommended that those writing a curriculum do extensive cross-checking of practice not only among other schools in the district but also among schools and curriculum projects outside the district. (See Recommendation No. 7, p. 19.)

A carefully wrought curriculum takes time to develop. The purposes must be clarified, the sequences established, the instructional materials selected. These processes go hand in hand. Those teachers involved in such undertakings should be given either released time or additional pay to do this work. A consensus of the conferees felt that of the two choices, work during the summer months would produce better results, for teachers would be completely free of classroom responsibilities.

The failure to involve classroom teachers in curriculum development shifts their attention away from the instructional guide and toward the textbook list in making decisions concerning instruction. Indeed, the textbook becomes the curriculum. Sometimes, school districts purchase textbooks without a thought for the overall curriculum, and from the texts proceed to develop school or district study guides outlining the English program. When an English curriculum is to be established, conferees agreed that a far more defensible position is first to decide on what should be taught, then to purchase the relevant books. If such a curriculum committee decides because of its inherent appeal, literary strengths, and sequential rationale, that *Silas Marner* should be taught to tenth grade English students, teachers will understand why they must stress work on this novel. If, however, *Silas Marner* is taught simply because it is in the literature anthology, something is drastically wrong with curricular thinking.[1] The textbook has here become the curriculum.

If schools develop programs before adopting textbooks, funds which are currently being expended on textbooks could be channeled to more useful book purchases. One of the most surprising findings of the National Study is that only a small percentage of English teachers regularly use the grammar-composition text supplied to their students. The large majority of teachers interviewed in the Project felt that such books were inadequate and ineffective. Lynch and Evans in *High School English Textbooks* point out the repetitive pattern of such texts—texts that differ more in the color of the cover and in inside illustrations than in content.[2] In many programs selection of a single resource handbook on grammar and composition for use by students over several grades seems more appropriate than the wasteful expenditure of funds on books for each grade level which are seldom used. (See discussions by Rice, p. 59; Martin, p. 48.)

> **Recommendation No. 6:** The department chairman should work out basic agreements about content and sequence with (1) the members of his department, (2) department chairmen of other high schools in the district, (3) those responsible for the English program at levels above and below the high school.

Arriving at basic agreements about content and sequence commonly presents little major difficulty on an individual school level. To a somewhat lesser degree, this is true of articulation with other high schools in the district. The problem seems greatest when articulation is attempted above and below the high school level. Junior high school teachers commonly attempt to teach material which they incorrectly believe high school teachers require. Conversely, high schools often assign certain books which teachers think are required by local colleges. Such "college required lists" usually exist in fancy rather than in fact.

Only free and continuous communication between high school English teachers and those who teach English at lower and higher levels will reduce such misunderstandings. Some high school departments exchange visiting days with local "feeder" schools or call semi-annual meetings of all teachers of English in the area. Similar arrangements can usually be made with local colleges.

An effective curriculum, of course, is one sufficiently flexible to allow both for varying needs of students and the individual initiative of teachers. Agreements with other schools and colleges should not be overly restrictive. However, in many districts teacher turnover, student transfers within schools and the district, and the desirability of developing sequence and continuity rather than yearly repetition of subject matter necessitates long range program planning.

---

[1] According to Scarvia B. Anderson's *Between the Grimms and "The Group": Literature in American High Schools*, the novel most frequently taught on the public high school level is *Silas Marner*.

[2] James J. Lynch and Bertrand Evans, *High School English Textbooks, A Critical Appraisal* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1963).

Many districts successfully work out an overall sequence of instruction at levels above and below the high school. Where this is not the case, high school department chairmen and teachers are in an excellent position to initiate agreements about content and sequence. (See discussions by Copeland, p. 108; Hach, p. 63; Rogers, p. 129.)

> **Recommendation No. 7:** Department chairmen should encourage teachers to participate in professional English institutes and in regional or national curriculum projects; and the results of these projects should be used as they are appropriate in individual school programs.

Numerous curriculum projects are now underway, almost all involving college scholars and high school or junior high school teachers. Such professional cooperation can be of great mutual value. Many of the institutes in English supported by the National Defense Education Act seek to inform teachers about the new approaches developed in the curriculum centers. Participation in such institutes and projects by teachers of English can do much to deepen awareness of new developments and to broaden professional outlook and knowledge.

Department chairmen should encourage teachers to apply for institutes and to keep abreast of reports emerging from the curriculum centers. Probably the best single sources of information about projects and institutes are the pages of the *English Journal* and *College English.* However, special publications of the Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English also contain information, as do the publications of state and regional English associations. A recent national study indicated that those teachers who are members of national subject matter associations, attend local and state professional meetings, and read such journals as the *English Journal* are more likely to be informed about new developments than are teachers who do not engage in these activities.[8]

One of the great frustrations of curriculum development is the inevitability of obsolescence. Conferees noted from personal experience that in a curriculum project developed over a period of several years much of the project could be outdated by the time it was introduced in all classrooms. As a result, conferees recommended that the scope of a major curriculum project be limited sufficiently so that there could be rapid implementation. Departments, therefore, do well to examine carefully even the initial materials released by curriculum centers and other projects, adapting what they can for the school's instructional program, rather than to await release of a complete three-year or four-year program which might require several additional years of teacher study.

---

[8] Committee on National Interest, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964).

Certainly no new English program based on current research should begin without considerable thought on the part of the English staff involved. Wariness and study, however, should not lead to total inactivity. One of the disturbing facts uncovered in the National Study of High School English Programs was the small number of schools attempting any kind of experimental program. Indeed so little experimental teaching of English was discovered in the original schools selected for study that supplementary funds were requested to permit staff visits to programs known to involve new approaches and new content. The lack of interest in experimentation, unfortunately, seems characteristic of schools across the nation. *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* reports:

> Experimentation with the modern methods of organizing instruction, through introduction of such administrative arrangements as team teaching, programed instruction, and organization of classes into special groups, would be more in evidence if teachers were thoroughly informed about them. But experimentation with innovations in English instruction seems slight despite the publicity given to the schools which are trying them. Less than 15 percent of the teachers report any of their colleagues experimenting with programed learning, team teaching, interschool visitation, teaching machines, large group instruction, or the use of lay readers.[4]

How much of the responsibility to nurture experimentation falls on the English chairman? Certainly the task of ensuring that the department and the school administration are kept continually aware of new approaches in both content and method is an important one; so, too, is the chairman's support for experimentally-minded teachers who wish to depart from the established curriculum. Unless the English chairman is alert to the possibilities of gradual change through planned experimentation, he runs the danger of creating a need for explosive, revolutionary curricular changes which inevitably follow periods of long inactivity and are frequently unsettling to teachers and students alike.

> **Recommendation No. 8: District supervisors or consultants should be appointed in multiple-school districts for the purpose of coordinating instruction in English at all levels and schools, but the responsibility for leadership in curriculum development, for supervision, for assignment, and for the quality of instruction in any particular high school should remain with the department chairman.**

The complexity and scope of English instruction from the elementary grades through the high school demands coordination on the district level. Such curriculum development requires the full-time appointment of district supervisors or consultants. If such personnel do not exist in a multiple-school district, a highly qualified person should be hired for this important coordinating position as soon as possible. Only a specialist in English, knowledgeable about content and method in the field, is adequately equipped to provide liaison between the large district and subject specialists in state and national offices, in regional colleges and universities, and in the professional subject associations. Conferees felt, however, that the duties of district supervisors preclude a direct leadership role in curriculum development, supervision, and teacher selection on the local high school level. These responsibilities must remain with the person directly involved in the school program—the department chairman. Evidence collected in visits to schools by staff members of the National Study of High School English Programs indicates that instruction suffers unless a qualified chairman in the school is assigned responsibility for the effectiveness of instruction.

---

[4] *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*, p. 7.

This report is not concerned with the administrative structure of the English program in grades below the high school level. It is probable, however, that in the absence of English specialists on the elementary level, a general supervisor or consultant will be assigned some responsibility for the entire K-12 program in English. (See discussion by Brett, p. 124.)

> **Recommendation No. 9:** The English faculty of each school should select its own textbooks, but where district or state policy requires approved lists, these outside lists should provide a rich variety of texts appropriate to students of varying intellectual capacities and needs.

Schools vary so widely in program and student body that textbook selection must be a function of each individual school. Surely teachers of English who are trusted with children can be trusted also to select the books to be taught.

One major obstacle is the widespread policy of state adopted texts. A number of conferees expressed the opinion that course and text would tend to be synonymous if state adoption precluded departmental choice. Ideally, an outside textbook list should serve only as a guideline for a competent staff. The problem becomes even more severe when state textbook adoption committees are politically appointed. Although no easy solution exists, the following suggestions for easing or eliminating the problem were noted:

1) Using supplementary books to supplant state adopted texts. If a state legislature finds that texts supplied by that state are not being used, eventual change is probable. The low cost of paperbacks has made the use of such supplemental books far more feasible than in the past.

2) Encouraging strong and vocal state associations of teachers of English to work for change in the textbook adoption policies on the state level.

3) Insisting through appropriate organizations of teachers that selection committees be dominated by a representative group of competent teachers of English. Although teachers of English are usually included on such committees, they do not always find themselves in the majority.

All schools should have highly competent staffs who know best the needs and abilities of the students in their individual school. Funds should be available for a variety of teaching materials appropriate for various levels of classes and students. Certainly textbooks should be carefully studied before adoption, and reports by English teachers on textbooks deserve serious consideration. Those who will use the textbooks should have a major voice in deciding which books should be purchased.

Almost unanimously conferees felt that textbook selection for five-year cycles was unnecessarily limiting and often unwise. In the past, budgetary reasons and the limited variety of texts may have justified such a practice. The situation today has changed. Paperbacks make feasible the purchase of a rich variety of books on even a modest budget. Publishers are responding to demands for more specialized texts and for texts utilizing current knowledge in linguistics, literature, composition. Teaching materials are changing so rapidly in English that a lag of five years—more than one high school generation—only accentuates the already too extensive lag between scholarship and application, between research and teaching, between theory and practice. Schools must continually seek, study, test, and adopt superior books for the classroom.

The occasional purchase and trial of one or two class sets of a new textbook is an excellent way to introduce innovation in the classroom by stimulating teachers to vary methods and materials. Moreover, the tryout of books in small quantities prior to adoption is likely to prove far less expensive than the widespread purchase of initially impressive but untested sets, which are later found unusable. As a result of similar personal experiences, the conferees recommend that adoption of a new text await the results of experimental use by qualified teachers. Their reactions should carry considerable weight for any textbook adoption committee. (See discussion by Thomas, p. 54.)

Teacher Selection and Assignment

Recommendation No. 10: The English department chairman should play a major role in recruiting and selecting English teachers.

What constitutes "a major role" in recruitment and selection of teachers varies with the size of the school or district, personnel policies, and geographical range of recruitment. In some situations the department chairman plays the dominant role. At the other extreme, particularly in some large cities, both the principal and the department chairman must wait until the opening of school in September to learn who the new staff members will be. Wherever school organization allows, the chairman should work closely with the principal in recruitment and selection. This involvement becomes more difficult as the size of the district increases. Even in large districts, however, the chairman must play a leading role in interviewing and evaluating applicants. Where systems must use central personnel offices to coordinate hiring procedures, the conferees recommend regular study of these procedures to make sure that personnel responsible are making good selections from among available candidates.

If personnel officers seek teachers throughout the country, the English department chairmen may on occasion accompany the personnel officer when several English teachers are to be selected. Where this is not possible, chairmen can still play some role in teacher selection. For example, they can help in deciding the retention of student teachers as staff members, in interviewing applicants who can visit the district and applicants for transfer within the district. Most important, they can let the personnel officer know not only the number of staff openings, but the particular requirements needed to fill these openings.

Despite problems, conferees made the recommendation vigorously. Most agreed that present recruitment and selection practices are not working well and must be changed if English instruction is to be strengthened. "Efficient business methods" of hiring teachers too often result in an impersonal and form-laden procedure that may keep able prospects out of the classroom, that often assumes that the same teacher, whether an English major or not, is equipped to teach reading to slow students in grade ten and rhetoric to advanced senior students.

A department chairman should be held responsible for the effectiveness of the English program. He cannot meet this responsibility unless he is significantly involved in selection procedures. This means working with the principal by interviewing candidates and evaluating their credentials whenever possible. Certainly no candidate should be hired against the expressed wishes of the chairman, especially if that chairman is to be held responsible for the work of his staff. (See discussions by Harris, p. 74; Ruggless, p. 118.)

Recommendation No. 11: The primary responsibility for assigning teachers of English should be that of the department chairman.

An English department chairman with the overall responsibilities and abilities outlined in this report is in the best position to assign classes to the English staff, since he knows both the English curriculum and the abilities of individual members of his department. Conferees felt that teacher selection by the department chairman was an important adjunct to this recommendation and that the responsibility for assigning teachers be given to the department chairman after he has had a primary voice in their initial selection. Conferees agreed that many problems exist in teacher assignment: "Should 'better' classes go to those with experience and seniority?" "Should teachers have classes from all three tracks, two tracks, or only one?" "If a teacher is really qualified in content and method, shouldn't he be able to teach at any grade level?" "How are remedial classes assigned when teachers in the department are not trained in this area?" Definitive answers are not at hand for such questions. Individual school situations will determine final answers, and the best person to resolve such problems is a well-qualified department chairman. Surely, the leadership of a department chairman is weakened considerably when persons outside the English program determine English teaching assignments. The principal will, nevertheless, be directly involved once the department chairman has completed a tentative class schedule. Such a procedure is especially necessary if English teachers have classes outside their field. (See discussion by Christison, p. 42.)

Recommendation No. 12: Teachers should be assigned to classes where they will teach most effectively, but the chairman should develop a system so that teachers gain experience at different grade levels and become familiar with the overall sequence of instruction.

One problem in rotating assignments within a department is that of prevailing attitudes. Some teachers and administrators feel that the higher the grade and grouping level, the more important the teaching assignment. A teacher of twelfth grade college-bound students thus seems to have higher status than a teacher of ninth grade students. Few in high school education, however, would say that one level is in reality more important than another, but the attitude is present nevertheless. With occasional shifting of classes, the English teacher with senior classes can see that a ninth or tenth grade class presents as many problems as a twelfth grade class. With teachers working at different grade levels at different times, there is far less opportunity for equating status with the classes taught. But more important, such occasional shifting will acquaint teachers with the overall sequence of instruction.

Conferees were concerned with unique situations in which a teacher might be highly qualified to teach in certain specialized areas but not in others. Teachers highly qualified in reading, in remedial work, in speech and drama, might best be left to teach in these areas with an opportunity to broaden their capabilities by observing regular English classes. Beginning teachers sometimes find their academic background inadequate to handle advanced placement or honors classes. On the other hand, lack of experience and minimal training may leave them ill-equipped for more "difficult" sections. Such exceptions need careful consideration by the department chairman.

Although the department chairman should have the primary voice in deciding on teacher assignments, he should involve members of the department in class scheduling. Many teachers know their own particular strengths. Others need the opportunity to request a change in assignment. Several conferees stated that, contrary to expectations, when asked to voice preferences, most teachers state preferences consistent with the judgment of the department chairman. Major differences of opinion call for a discussion of the problem with the individual teacher and an explanation of the reasons behind the disputed decision.

Typically, the department chairman now teaches junior or senior English classes. All too frequently, he continues teaching only on upper grade levels. To the extent that he is best suited to teach in a specific ability or grade level, he should teach most of his classes on this level. His background and training, however, should enable him to teach on other levels also. The responsibilities of his position require that he do so. His staff will be more willing to rotate, the chairman can give more sympathetic help, and this rotation will enable him to evaluate the total program. (See discussion by Christison, p. 42.)

> **Recommendation No. 13:** Each chairman should teach at least one class, but for each five teachers or major fraction thereof, he should be released one period (in addition to his regular preparation period) for duties as English department chairman.

The scope of the responsibilities recommended for a department chairman in this report will create far more work than is presently expected of many holding this position. Released time for the chairman is particularly important if there is to be a definite supervision and direction to the English program. To be sure, one criterion for choosing a department chairman is his ability as a teacher. As a result, certain conferees felt it unfortunate that one of the better teachers in the department would teach fewer classes. Nevertheless, the critical value of freeing the chairman for departmental leadership was apparent to all. The recommendation is based on the assumption that in any school of 2,000 or more pupils, the department chairman would teach only one class and be freed during the remainder of the day for supervision and curriculum development.

Teacher Education

Recommendation No. 14: The chairman should assess the needs of teachers for inservice courses, institutes, and workshops; advise and counsel teachers concerning course selection; and work with college or district authorities to make such offerings available.

The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English presented some distressing facts about inservice education for teachers of English.

> How much inservice education have teachers of English and the language arts been able to secure? The majority of the youngest elementary teachers, those with six to ten years, have attended one summer session. Those with sixteen or more years' experience have averaged two summer sessions. Elementary teachers on the average take one summer session for each eight years of experience.
>
> Thirty percent of the secondary teachers of English in this survey have not taken a course in English for more than ten years. Though 53.3 percent frequently complete course work at a college or university during summers, only 27.6 percent regularly do and 17.0 percent rarely do. The average teacher of secondary English has completed 15.48 semester credits during some nine years of teaching experience, an average of about 1.72 semester hours per year. This average could be maintained if every English teacher attended summer session only once in every four or five years.[1]

Department chairmen and district supervisors should be aware that simply scheduling workshops does not bring to teachers the professional help they need. Too often such workshops are general in character; sometimes they are indifferently planned. "Participation in workshops" was rated fifth of five categories in a "Ranking of Resources of Greatest Help by Different Groups of Teachers."[2] Workshops need far more careful preparation if they are to be effective.

Teachers generally, especially English majors, have a better academic background in literature than in composition and language study. Almost two thirds of all secondary teachers of English are uncertain about their effectiveness in teaching composition. Only about 40 percent have completed course work in the English language.[3] A department chairman of English should evaluate the background and training of his English staff in these areas. If advanced composition and language study courses are available locally, he should encourage his teachers to attend. If these courses are not available, he should (perhaps with the help of other department chairmen) encourage local colleges and districts to start such programs.

---

[1] Committee on National Interest, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1964), p. 6.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 48, Table 30.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

The fact that only half the high school teachers of English have undergraduate majors in English attests to widespread inadequacy of preparation. To be sure, not all who lack majors in English lack proficiency. One conferee, for example, felt that teachers with speech or drama majors were among his better teachers of English. This cannot stand as an argument in favor of peripheral or tangential preparation, however. It suggests, rather, that personal characteristics and independent study may compensate for a lack of certain collegiate experiences. Perhaps even more to the point, it suggests that training in public speaking and oral interpretation of literature may be indispensable for all teachers of English.

All teachers require a program of continuing education. Much of the undergraduate training received by teachers of English is inadequate. Even with an outstanding undergraduate program, teachers soon find themselves out of date in a very few years unless they maintain a program of inservice and continuing education. The current program of institutes in English should help familiarize teachers with new content and new approaches. To attract teachers to special inservice courses or to regional institutes, a school district can and should provide such incentives as salary increments for those who complete them satisfactorily. (See discussion by Thomas, p. 54; Rice, p. 59; See, p. 85.)

> **Recommendation No. 15:** Chairmen should encourage the English faculty to cooperate with local teacher education institutions in providing varied and necessary field experiences for student teachers.

Participation in local programs for preparing future teachers of English is an important responsibility of any English chairman and one that is far too often neglected or overlooked. Beginning teachers will enter the profession with desirable classroom preparation only as care has been taken to ensure planned and thoughtful experiences during preservice education. This is a responsibility which must be assumed by the total profession, not the teacher education institutions alone. As the individual who best knows the English faculty in a particular school, the chairman is in a unique position to cooperate with college officials in planning student teaching, observation, and participation experiences. He will know those teachers who can provide the most helpful guidance for beginners, and he will discuss with specialists in English from the neighboring colleges the unique opportunities available to the novice teacher. The department will benefit from such cooperation as much as will the college through the close working relationships established with college specialists in the teaching of English, in the continual rethinking of ends and means required to interpret program and procedures to each year's student teachers, and in the enthusiasm and zest for education which many of the young people bring to the profession.

> **Recommendation No. 16:** Chairmen should encourage the participation of teachers in conferences designed to bring together high school

> and college teachers of English, articulation conferences sponsored by universities, meetings and institutes planned by NCTE and its affiliates, and the advanced placement conference of the College Entrance Examination Board.

Among speakers on the programs of regional and national conferences in English are key persons in all aspects of English. No individual school district could hope to attract more than a fraction of these experts. School boards should consider such professional meetings as an inexpensive method of inservice training and therefore should provide more funds to allow teachers to attend these regional and national conferences.

School boards often approve funds to send district and local administrators to curriculum and subject area conferences on the assumption that they will in turn pass this information on to the larger group of teachers. There is much to recommend this course of action. Certainly, those in administrative positions must be aware of current professional activities. It is, however, ironic that so few teachers below the college level are sent regularly to national or even state professional conventions. Such activities can be of great value to teachers. Interest in professional meetings is clear. "Over half of the teachers reported attending a local or regional meeting of English teachers within the previous year, 30 percent attended a state meeting of English teachers, and 5.1 percent attended a national meeting."[4]

To encourage greater participation in professional meetings, each department should receive a budget to underwrite the expense of selected teachers to attend state and national professional subject matter meetings. Probably the department chairman should administer this budget as he is in the best position to assess the needs of the English staff, and, with the cooperation of the staff, to recommend those teachers who may profit from a specific conference. Some districts see that extensive funds are available to encourage participation of teachers at subject matter meetings held within a reasonable distance from the school—say, 150 miles. In such instances, a school automobile might be provided as a convenience to several teachers. Other districts offer to pay the travel expenses to teachers admitted to institutes located far from the school site.

For distant meetings, funds are necessarily more limited but should still be prorated and assigned to permit the maximum benefit to the departments. Quite possibly the chairman will wish to take at least one other member of the department to every conference that he attends. The chairman will also see that those who attend conferences, institutes, and meetings have an opportunity to discuss their findings with their fellow teachers. (See discussion by Rice, p. 59; See, p. 85.)

> **Recommendation No. 17:** Visits by observers from colleges should be encouraged, including visits by student teachers and teachers of

---

[4] Committee on the National Interest, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

> freshman college classes; and chairmen should cooperate with other schools in arranging for visits by other high school teachers.

One direct benefit of the recent physics and mathematics curricular programs has been the precedent of cooperation between college scholars and high school teachers. In English cooperation and coordination between colleges (particularly on the freshman level) and high schools is increasing. However, in many regions cooperation and visitation between high schools and colleges remain sporadic and ineffective. Too seldom do high school chairmen invite college teachers of freshman English to visit classes. Visits should not be a one-way proposition, of course; high school teachers should also visit college freshman classes to see the nature of teaching by college teachers.

Professors of education are sometimes as isolated from the realities of high school instruction as are professors of English. Conferees recommended that those who train high school teachers should observe students in high schools to counteract the isolation of professors of secondary education (not supervisors of student teaching) from today's high school student. Even if such professors have had previous high school teaching experience, they must realize that students of the 1960's display as a group characteristics different from those of students of the early fifties. (See discussion by Rogers, p. 129.)

> **Recommendation No. 18:** Procedures should be developed to permit teachers to visit English classes in their own schools, in other schools, and at other levels of instruction, with provision for payment of substitutes.

Conference participants felt that intervisitation of classes and schools is an excellent practice, one which not only permits the observation of other teachers, but also provides an opportunity to view other levels of instruction. In schools that do not yet provide this opportunity, conferees recommended that the above recommendation be adopted. Departmental chairmen particularly interested in developing awareness of new approaches or new ideas might plan a series of observations. State and district English supervisors, perhaps in consultation with local English associations, may compile a helpful list of schools and classrooms to be visited. (See discussion by Copeland, p. 108.)

Supervision

> **Recommendation No. 19:** The principal and the chairman should jointly agree upon the responsibilities for supervising, including evaluating teacher competence, so that the department chairman may work cooperatively with the principal and district supervisor in supervising the English program and its teachers.

Participants at both conferences felt that some kind of agreement, preferably written, should be developed by the department chairman and the principal which would specify the chairman's responsibilities. Since traditionally the major responsibility for supervision and evaluation has been assigned the principal and sometimes the supervisor, a clearly defined policy regarding the department chairman's role must be established. With added duties come additional responsibilities. In the present pattern of highly limited authority, a department chairman cannot ultimately be held responsible for the English program. Most important is the recognition of the chairman's personal responsibility with respect to the quality of the English program and evaluation of instruction. If a department chairman is given administrative responsibilities, released time, and added pay, he in turn must be held responsible for the English program. (See discussion by Brown, p. 92; Ruggless, p. 118; Brett, p. 124.)

> **Recommendation No. 20:** A program of supervision including class visiting and conferences should be developed for all those teaching English classes.

School principals and district curriculum consultants can be highly effective in helping teachers with problems in discipline, techniques of teaching, and involvement with a total school program. Few such administrators, however, pretend to be expert in all subject areas. Visitation and conference by a qualified subject area specialist are of equal importance.

Some districts have subject area specialists. Their district duties, however, usually preclude an intensive program of class visitation and conference with all of the teachers in their district. Nevertheless, conferees felt that all teachers should be visited, whether beginning teachers or tenured teachers, and that each visit should normally be followed by a conference. On the local school level a qualified department chairman is in the most appropriate position to provide regular supervision. (See discussion by Casey, p. 78; Brown, p. 92.)

> **Recommendation No. 21:** The chairman should help teachers with the continued evaluation of student performance in language, composition, and literature, especially with the preparation of formal tests.

The kinds of evaluation suggested in this recommendation are particularly useful to new teachers. The department chairman is responsible for a continued evaluation of the work of students in English. Empirical and standardized tests can often point out areas of subject deficiencies in a department. A reevaluation of the curriculum by the chairman and his staff would then be in order to correct such deficiencies.

Several department chairmen at the conferences felt that next to class visitation the examination of formal tests was the best indication of the type and quality of work done by the members of the English staff. Discussion of such tests by the chairman with teachers can lead to a more coordinated English program and to more meaningful instruction. Some departments regularly discuss appropriate end-of-the-year examinations at their grade level or schoolwide meetings. Although the final responsibility for selecting and writing the examinations may be assigned to the chairman or to a special faculty committee, an open consideration of the merits of various questions and the design of the examinations can do much to reawaken awareness of the purposes of instruction. (See discussions by Hach, p. 63; Casey, p. 78.)

Public Attitudes toward English

Recommendation No. 22: The English department chairman should recognize his responsibility to inform the public about the teaching of English by talks to parent and community groups, by reports to the board of education, by printed bulletins and mass media; consequently, he should have adequate time to fulfill this function.

Conferees reported a breakdown of communication between the school's English department and parents and opinion leaders in many communities. Complaints throughout the country about books taught in English are often a result of a community's being uninformed or misinformed about its schools' English program. Complaints about students' lack of ability to write, spell, and think can frequently be reduced with some simple facts or an honest explanation of the program.

All too frequently boards of education hear reports and interpretations of the needs of English departments from persons not directly involved in the departments. Administrative presentations can be valuable, but surely the most accurate interpretation (and sometimes translation) is the one given by a person directly involved with students and teachers—normally the department chairman. A chairman does have a definite responsibility to make needs known to a school board.

Interested teachers, especially those involved in school publications, can often be helpful to the chairman in using the mass media to report on a school's English program. One oblique method of channeling information to the press is a special press release when the school is recognized for some achievement.

Certainly the teaching of English is in part a "service function." English after all is a bedrock subject on which instruction in all curricular areas is based, and on the effectiveness of its teaching depends much of the strength of the total school program. But most English teachers, like the conferees, do not believe that this function should be the only basis for English instruction. The public must be informed that English hopes to do much more than teach the use of the semicolon or the difference between *there* and *their*. Important as this information may be, it is certainly subservient to the humanizing power of literature, the knowledge of the basic structure of one's language, and the ability to read and think perceptively. Such areas in the content of English should be explained to the community. Little support for English can be expected unless the public is aware of the hopes and ambitions of the program.

Recommendation No. 23: Each school should operate under an established written procedure for handling parental complaints about books, patterned on the form requesting reconsideration of a book as suggested in *The Students' Right to Read.*[1]

Some school districts foreseeing the problems of complaints about books have established written procedures to handle such complaints. Other districts have seen the wisdom of written procedure only after such complaints have been made. Conferees strongly suggested that such a written policy is necessary to avert attacks.

The National Council of Teachers of English has noted that the book complaints cases brought to its attention have invariably come from districts without an established written policy. The form which a complainant is invited to file, "Citizen's Request for Reconsideration of a Book," contains such questions as: "Did you read the entire book?" "What do you feel might be the result of reading this book?" and "Are you aware of the judgment of this book by literary critics?" Such questions prevent unthinking, hasty, and scurrilous attacks on books taught in English classes. Without a written policy and such a questionnaire a chairman and his staff are highly vulnerable to attack. All conferees discussing this recommendation agreed that if such a written policy is not in effect in a school or school district, then the department chairman should be the key figure in initiating such a policy. (See discusssion by Thomas, p. 54.)

---

[1] Committee on Right to Read, *The Students' Right to Read* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1962). See form reproduced in Appendix C, p. 157-158.

Areas of Discussion and Controversy

The preceding recommendations reflect the reactions, concerns, and ideas of conferees at both the Urbana and Cleveland conferences regarding most of the issues raised by the papers presented. Extensive discussion, which followed the written commentaries, raised a number of issues and points of controversy. The following issues were among the more difficult to resolve or else created the most discussion before agreement was reached.

SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS

A few conferees saw the role of a department chairman as a master teacher—one whose lack of administrative responsibility in supervision and evaluation would be an advantage in discussing problems with members of his department. Responsibilities for hiring and firing might interfere with this type of assistance to members of an English department. The group agreed, however, that a department chairman as envisaged in this report, working in cooperation with the principal or district supervisor, must also be responsible for evaluation. Virtually all of the conferees agreed that a department chairman should be involved in the hiring of his staff. The consensus was that if one accepts this responsibility then he must also share the responsibility for determining whether a teacher should be retained or dismissed. Without direct involvement in supervision, a department chairman can not know accurately the strengths and weaknesses of the members of his department. Without this knowledge his effectiveness as a leader is diminished.

Conferees felt that although the principal or district supervisor can view a teacher from the overall school situation, most teachers welcome evaluation by a specialist in their field. The suggestion was made that every teacher of English has a *right* to be evaluated by a person knowledgeable about English.

Conferees unanimously agreed that whatever the supervisory duties of the department chairman they would in no way infringe upon the principal's or superintendent's responsibility in the final evaluation regarding retention or dismissal of a teacher.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF TEACHERS

Travis Harris's paper "The English Department Chairman's Role in Recruiting and Selecting Teachers" presented a specific situation that is unusual in American public education. Mr. Harris's thesis was that a department chairman should have an important role in the selection of his teacher. One conferee attacked the description as " . . . a utopian situation tailored to the fancies, whims, and prejudices of an English specialist without regard for the relationship of the

English department to the high school faculty or the administration." Others disagreed with Mr. Harris's ideas expressing a special preference for long term teachers with much experience, for visiting prospective teachers in a teaching situation before hiring them, and for certain minimum working conditions suggested in the paper. There was agreement, however, on the necessity of involving the chairman in the selection of the members of his staff. The problems inherent in a large system were noted; but conferees felt that even in the largest system some involvement was not only possible but necessary for the establishment of a well rounded, diversified English staff. Those present in both Urbana and Cleveland agreed with staff members of the National Study of High School English Programs that present policies of recruitment and assignment of English teachers do not work well in most large school districts and seriously limit the effectiveness of instruction in English.

Extra Pay for Department Chairmen

The conferees at the Urbana conference had considered recommending a specific amount or a percentage in excess of base salary which should be paid a department chairman. The amount paid to those chairmen attending the conferences ranged from $200 to $3,000. Despite several attempts at a formula, no specific recommendation was made. There seemed to be a general feeling among the conferees that with such a disparity of pay no single amount or formula could be established that could take into account local and state conditions. The group felt, however, that a chairman whose responsibilities and professional background are similar to those outlined in this report should be paid far more than a chairman who fills a largely honorary position. The pattern of salaries for those with equivalent administrative responsibilities within a given school district would undoubtedly be the best base upon which to determine extra pay for department chairmen.

The Assignment of Teachers

Although conferees agreed that the primary responsibility for the assignment of English classes should rest with the department chairman, difficult issues remained. The assignment of teachers to basic classes poses a problem when additional training (e.g., in the teaching of reading) is required for a more difficult teaching assignment. One conferee raised the question "Why should teachers prepare themselves for an assignment they would rather not be given?"

The recommendation that some rotation of teaching assignment is needed to ensure that the department is aware of problems in the sequence of the curriculum caused considerable discussion. Few if any teachers or administrators would go on record as saying that one grade level is more important than another. Yet teachers still consider an assignment to a higher grade or ability group as a promotion. The rotation of teaching assignments will help break down this situation. By rotating his own teaching assignment, a department chairman can help convince his staff of the importance of all classes in English.

Individuals admitted, however, that some teachers are well fitted for one track or one grade level, but are unqualified to teach in another track or grade. Such problems must be handled by the department chairman on an individual basis.

ORGANIZATION OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

Many approaches to departmental organization were discussed at the two conferences. In one commentary questions were raised about the division of the eleventh grade into a semester of composition and a semester of literature. Discussion centered on the questions "Are teachers able to handle the composition load when this emphasis is given for an entire semester?" "Does composition become sterile when based only on articles from periodicals rather than on the study of literature?" "Is it possible to reach the goals the school has set in engendering an appreciation and understanding of American literature in a one semester course?" The consensus seemed to be that although such a program can work, the year program that combines literature and composition is preferable to splitting these two areas of English. However, the chairmen recognized that too few preservice and inservice courses, methods books, and instructional guides provide teachers with concrete assistance in interrelating instruction in composition and literature.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION

Ruth Herin's paper "English Departments in Relation to Other Departments" presents many interesting examples of interdepartmental work and cooperation. While the conferees felt such cooperation of value, some questioned its ultimate scope. One commentary pointed out that:

> We are just emerging from an era of anti-departmentalization from the period of the "child-centered" or "whole child" philosophies, during which administrators in general and the educational establishment as a whole frowned upon anything that might lead to "compartmentalization" in the curricula.

Certainly the overall English program suggested in this report stresses greater "compartmentalization" than is presently the case. Effective interdepartmental correlation between English and other school subjects has probably failed more than it has succeeded. Such projects to improve the level of spoken and written English outside the English classroom likewise seldom seem to succeed. One discussant made the following comment:

> I have come to question, for example, whether painfully prepared "handbooks" and other similarly formal statements issued schoolwide on behalf of better writing, spelling, speech, etc., get enough attention from the great majority of teachers to repay the time, effort, and sometimes expense required to pre-

pare them. Such appeals also, it seems to me, place us at times in an untenable light before our colleagues. How can we consistently ask for reduced teaching loads and at the same time suggest that our job is more than we can handle alone? This is not what we intend to imply, of course, but unfortunately this is a way that many of our fellow teachers misinterpret our motives. Also, there are too many administrators who are all too ready to interpret our recommendations to mean that "all teachers are teachers of English."

Over Organization

If a choice had to be made between an over organized department as opposed to an under organized one, several conferees indicated strongly their preference for the latter. As one conferee stated, "The people we most want to attract to teaching are individuals not eager for efficiency or happy under regimentation. If a system is operating smoothly, be on the alert for irreparable losses." A detailed curriculum, numerous departmental and interdepartmental meetings, patriarchal leadership, and highly structured courses of study can be used to impress others with an outstanding English program. Such rigidity, however, can stifle two of the most important ingredients of good teaching—creativity and initiative.

A good teacher's time is a valuable commodity. An over organized, over planned program can be destructive to the time teachers need for themselves.

Overall Role of the English Chairman

A look at the traditional role of an English department chairman prompted sharp attack and discussion. One commentary compared a description of this role to Wylie Sypher's characterization of the "new man as functionary." He "does not hire, fire, or evaluate teachers." He discusses "district changes and innovations" with supervisors once a month. He "serves as a sounding board for suggestions." He "carries thoughts from the top down and from the bottom up." He "implements" the new curriculum. He "functions outside the line of staff organization in an advisory capacity." Such a role can be compared with that of Sypher's functionary who is "completely available to others," who moves in an endless system of relationships, whose work is directed by forces over which he has little control. The functionary is a victim of the "new fatality; the law of diminished responsibility."

The great diffusion of responsibilities in decision making causes the English department chairmen in too many schools to serve their days as virtually powerless functionaries. When they are not distributing supplies, filing reports, or comforting angry parents and teachers, they are on the run from one coordinating meeting to another. They are permitted to emerge now and then from the apparatus of the system to call a few routine department meetings. But without power to effect significant curricular change, without influence in the employment and dismissal of staff members, they remain detached from any individual responsibility in the direction of the instructional program. Their amorphous

position renders them impotent in making the decisions and choices that count.

The end purpose of the recommendations and papers of this report is to view this "functionary" as an educational relic of the past and to present in his place a responsible leader—one with a well defined and vital professional role.

PART III

Responsibilities of the English Department Chairman

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

In preparation for the three-day Illinois conference, twelve participants were asked to prepare a paper discussing in detail a problem in organizing, administering, and supervising high school English departments. Sue Brett of the U. S. Office of Education was also asked to present a paper on a recent conference of supervisors of English. These papers were mimeographed and distributed to conferees in advance of the conference, so that participants were prepared to criticize and evaluate each proposal. At the three-day conference, participants evaluated each paper as a committee of the whole, except that two or three participants, in addition to the author, were designated in advance to comment on each paper. This procedure was followed for all prepared papers so that the implications of each could be examined in depth with respect to the variety of conditions which face departmental chairmen in schools.

The three additional papers in this section include reports on a survey conducted by the national committee and a summary of recommendations on supervision developed at a conference called by the United States Office of Education. Included also is a speech presented by Robert W. Rogers, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois, on the needed cooperation between high school and college departments of English. Dean Rogers served as head of the University of Illinois English Department prior to accepting his present position in 1964. He was also Director of the National Conference of College English Chairmen at Allerton Park, Illinois, which resulted in a series of resolutions calling for greater leadership from college departments in the teaching of English.

These reports are the work of individual writers and reflect their personal views and specific school situations. In most cases, the participants agreed orally or tacitly with the ideas presented. Sharp division and disagreement that did exist were noted in the section "Areas of Discussion and Controversy."

RESPONSIBILITIES IN ESTABLISHING, DEVELOPING, AND EVALUATING AN ENGLISH PROGRAM

1. "Organizing the English Department for Effective Instruction"
   JEAN L. B. CHRISTISON, *English Department Chairman,*
   Rincon High School, Tucson, Arizona

2. "The Role of the Department Chairman in Curriculum Development"
   JOSEPHINE MARTIN, *English Department Chairman,*
   Pine Bluff High School, Pine Bluff, Arkansas

3. "The Chairman's Role in Selecting Textbooks and Library Books"
   NELL H. THOMAS, *English Department Chairman,*
   Greenville High School, Greenville, Mississippi

4. "Disseminating Results of New Research in English"
   FRANK M. RICE, *Codirector of the Nebraska Development Center,*
   University of Nebraska

5. "The Role of the Chairman in Evaluating the Program and in Maintaining Sequence"
   CLARENCE W. HACH, *English Department Chairman,*
   Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois

Organizing the English Department for Effective Instruction

Jean L. B. Christison
English Department Chairman
Rincon High School
Tucson, Arizona

The task of organizing an English department for effective instruction begins even before school opens. I was appointed chairman some months before Rincon High School opened in September, 1958, and was faced with the task, assisted by the principal and the coordinator of language arts, of selecting teachers and books and of furnishing and preparing an English wing (thirteen classrooms) and department office. Three problems which occupied attention then are primary topics of discussion in this paper.

1. The kinds of classes set up, both regulation and experimental, their equipment, and the ways in which teachers are selected to work with the different groups.
2. The department office, its equipment and uses, as well as the way in which it sets the climate for the department.
3. The ways of promoting cooperation among English teachers—shared teaching, inservice training, the department bulletin, and the department meetings.

Rincon, as well as the other four high schools in the Tucson district, requires students to complete eight semesters of English for graduation. Certain English electives are also offered: beginning and advanced journalism; beginning and advanced speech; creative writing, and a reading laboratory program.

There is grouping at all levels: freshmen are divided into average, honors, and basic classes—the last taught in a core program with social studies; sophomores are also grouped as average, honors, and basic classes, with an added class for remedial readers who have been singled out by their high scores on the Lorge-Thorndike nonverbal test. These students will receive individualized instruction in the reading laboratory.

Courses have been fluid since the school opened. Not until Rincon's second year were honors classes introduced experimentally and then only on the freshman and senior levels. Before introducing honors classes in 1959-60, a committee of teachers from the department worked with the coordinator of language arts to produce a study, *Report of Committee to Outline Courses for Honors Classes.* In 1960-61 honors classes were added at the sophomore and junior levels. Citywide committees also worked on suggested units for the Advanced Placement Program.

The twenty-one members of our English department are well-prepared academically: one holds a Ph.D.; two have Master's degrees plus forty-five units; one has a Master's degree plus fifteen units; fourteen have Master's degrees; and the remainder are working for an M.A. degree. We maintain a good balance between the sexes—ten men to eleven women. The ratio is also balanced between the teachers who encourage creativity and those who are methodical, demanding, and thorough.

The greatest problem in allocating teachers has been finding the right person for basic classes. The students in these classes are a year and a half or more retarded in reading, which means that the teacher should have some knowledge of remedial reading techniques. We have been fortunate to have teachers with past junior high school experience in reading skills. Besides a knowledge of techniques, teachers of basic classes need patience, a profound ability to sense and work with individual differences, and a keen respect for the child's image of himself. To help these teachers, a district booklet of suggestions, compiled by teachers of basic classes, is available. The first evaluation of the core program for freshman basic classes mentions a more relaxed and alive classroom atmosphere, to which students respond favorably. Having both a social studies and an English teacher results in better rapport with all students.

Not all teachers are adapted to teaching honors classes. Ideally all should experience all levels and all groups, but some teachers are attracted to honors groups for "prestige" and see no deeper purpose for instruction than that they assign "more of the same." The teacher of an honors group must himself be creative, knowledgeable in the humanities, and able to see subtle relationships between the arts. He should have a good historical understanding, and, above all, must be ready to do the unconventional.

In the Tucson school system, freshman and sophomore years are textbook courses: that is, courses based on an assigned literature anthology and composition-grammar book, chosen by a systemwide committee of teachers. Because we feel that the new teacher will be more secure with a text at first, we place him at one or both of these levels. However, there are sets of supplementary materials available, permitting the teacher to depart from the literature anthology almost entirely in favor of units suited to his classes. He learns that he must plan work according to the makeup of an individual class. Above all, he learns that he does not teach the text from page one on.

The course regarded as most difficult to teach—but most rewarding after one has mastered it—is the junior course in composition, a one-semester course based on the premise that any student will write if he can react to something which interests him.

> American periodicals are used to help students: improve their composition as they become familiar with sources of current information on many subjects; become familiar with the techniques of gathering and organizing materials through training in the use of *Reader's Guide;* outlining, notetaking, and pre-

> paring footnotes and bibliographies; present this material orally and in writing in a meaningful way; become familiar with magazines as a source of good current writing.[3]

Teachers here must be flexible, aware of the best current writing, able to work with individuals among considerable commotion (research and group discussion, students going to the cubicle where bound volumes are distributed, etc.). To broaden the perspective, the department office has copies of a few international magazines such as *Realities*, *The Illustrated London News*, *The Manchester Guardian*, and *Maclean's*. An aid to teaching this course is the systemwide publication produced by a committee of teachers under the coordinator of language arts, *Teacher's Guide—English 5 and 6*.

English 6 alternates with English 5, a room library course in American literature. About 300 volumes of American literature provide abundant materials for individual or group thematic readings. Three sets of anthologies are available for those teachers who wish to make use of common readings. In addition there are sets of paperbacks for common or small group reading at different levels: *Ethan Frome*, *The Great Gatsby*, *The Old Man and the Sea*, *Babbitt*, *Moby Dick*, *The Red Badge of Courage*, *John Brown's Body*, *Sixteen Famous American Plays*, *The Crucible*. The practice of putting the old standby teachers in the upper classes is not followed; instead the department policy has teachers rotate from one course to another after two or three years in one situation, a time long enough for the teacher to construct creative units at each class level. He is encouraged to share these with his fellow teachers.

The senior year is another room library course in world literature, with emphasis on English literature. In addition, we use a language text, *Guide to Modern English* by Richard Corbin and Porter Perrin (Scott, Foresman). Literature, language units, and composition are interspersed through the year as the teacher decides. This course attracts teachers whose graduate work has emphasized English rather than American literature, but we hope every teacher will experience seniors at some time. In addition to the 300 volumes contained in the classroom, the teacher may use one of three available sets of anthologies. Seniors may also use class sets of *Death of a Salesman*, *Sixteen Famous British Plays*, *Sixteen Famous European Plays*, *Hamlet*, *The Oedipus Plays* of Sophocles, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, *Lord of the Flies*, *The Return of the Native*, *Heart of Darkness*, *Crime and Punishment*, *Canterbury Tales*, or materials such as multiple folk epics—*Beowulf*, *Nibelungenlied*, *The Ramayana*, *The Song of Roland*, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, *The Lusiads*.

Junior and senior classes are grouped only into average and honors since the nature of the room library course allows for individualized reading. In English 6, one boy may draw upon *Hot Rod* or *Motor Trend* to write upon some phase of mechanics, while another may analyze the current themes of short stories in *Harper's*, *Atlantic Monthly* and *The New Yorker*; yet another may examine the various treatments of the international situation by *Time*, *News-*

---

[3] *Secondary Curriculum: Program of Studies*, Tucson Public Schools, p. 21.

week, and *U. S. News and World Report*. In English 7-8, one student may be reading *The Snowgoose* and another, *War and Peace*—yet both can, at different levels, take part in a discussion of man and his destiny.

Three teachers have special training in teaching reading; therefore, we could embark on the reading laboratory program in prospect for next year. Students with specific reading problems or particular deficiencies are being directed to this elective course. Class size will be limited to sixteen so that we may provide individualized attention.

The teaching climate at Rincon is bracing. The school is fortunate to have an appreciative and encouraging administration and a helpful coordinator of language arts. Requisitions are rarely denied and the principal has allowed the chairman to interview applicants for English teaching positions and to examine their folders on personnel. The principal has granted a fair hearing to recommendations arising out of department meetings and, where possible, acted upon their suggestions. He visits the classes of new teachers, as does the coordinator of language arts, and accepts invitations to visit special projects. These visits are followed by a conference between the teacher and the principal. It is the duty of the principal to rule on tenure which a teacher may attain at the end of three years' experience in the system.

Our large English office, for which we have a secretary, is the central meeting and work space for all teachers. It houses teaching aids, equipment, and book materials, and offers opportunities for various activities to be planned and pursued. Sometimes the office is used for students who are doing make-up tests—but ideally the area is used for uninhibited discussion of problems by teachers, or with students. For everyone's benefit, there are a bulletin board and a library table for displaying current professional reading materials—*English Journal, Elementary English, College English, PMLA, Modern Language Journal, Clearing House, The New York Times* Sunday edition. In addition, we have access to the literary supplement to *The London Times* and subscribe to *Wilson Library Bulletin, Coming Events in Britain*, and *Down East*.

The office files hold curriculum material and test results for teacher use. Each teacher owns a cumulative class record sheet, with stanine scores for each of his students in all achievement tests, Grades 1 through 12. Results from the California Reading Test help the teacher group freshmen; the sophomore year the student's L-Score from the American Psychological Examination is added. In both junior and senior year the English Cooperative Test is administered. Also on file are our students' grades in freshman English at the University of Arizona if we wish to compare these with our own placement of the same students.

A teacher progress report on English 3-4R (remedial) together with a Reading Diagnostic Record will be consulted by the student's English teacher next year. The report include materials used in reading instruction. Also available from the office are semester examinations and certain units that have proved successful for the use of new teachers.

Supplementary materials in the office also include reference books: *Webster's*

Third (all the classrooms have the unabridged *Second*); Roget's *International Thesaurus*; Bartlett's *Quotations*; an unabridged *Oxford Dictionary*; Bergen Evans' *Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage*; Margaret Nicolson's *Dictionary of American English Usage*; world almanacs; *Reader's Guide* and many others. There are paperback sets, too, of Roget's *Thesaurus* and Soule's *Synonyms*. Since the policy in the system has students pay an English fee of $1.50, rather than buy an anthology at junior and senior levels, we are able to buy sets of paperbacks and supplementary materials in yearly increasing variety, as well as equip the classroom libraries with books and magazines.

The equipment available in the department office includes three record players; a movie projector and screen (all classrooms are self-contained audio-visual units with venetian window blinds and blackout curtain for the door); a television with portable stand; two tape recorders; and a filmstrip and slide projector, with several individual filmstrip viewers. We have an overhead projector and a record listening center where students, using earphones, can listen in small groups at the back of the classroom. Reading teachers are responsible for the special equipment for their laboratory—tachistoscope and timed reader—and all teachers who sign out equipment or class sets of books are also responsible to the office for their safekeeping.

We do not own a department film collection but order these mainly from the University of Arizona. Our record collection is quite complete—several Shakespearean plays, much poetry, short stories, folklore, music, ballads and a few "books on records." In addition, we have access to aids from the Educational Materials Department at the Education Center. Here we can order and have sent to us promptly further records, offsets, bulletin board display material, and extra equipment such as an opaque projector or a Du Kane micromatic record and filmstrip projector.

At Rincon the English chairman teaches three classes, is freed for two periods to work in the office, and has a planning period and a study hall. To be as useful as possible as a resource person, the chairman must teach at different levels and be familiar with each point of view and approach.

There are three main ways by which a chairman can keep in touch with the department: by daily talk and exchange of ideas, by a weekly bulletin sent out to all members, and by periodic department meetings.

Department meetings are of three kinds: small group orientation meetings for new teachers at the first of the school year, conducted by an experienced teacher from each grade level (we also assign new teachers to experienced teachers for the first weeks of school); meetings which center on one problem at one grade level for quick solution of the problem; and the more formal department meeting with careful planning and an agenda which arises out of department problems. Teachers who are discontented with class load or feel that they are not getting materials on time, may develop resentments that obscure their desire to share ideas and discuss class procedures. This is the time when a department meeting serves to eliminate their disgruntlement and instill confidence in them.

What are we working toward? Some of our areas of agreement and disagreement supply at least the direction of our thinking. We are working toward being a more lively and perceptive group who examine current research and are willing to undertake some experimentation. This does not mean superficial experimentation, involving lay readers or different ways to use tape recorders, but in more basic issues: what amount of time should we spend in our classrooms with linguistics when we know that we are teaching a separate science which has no (as yet) perceptible influence on the way our students read and write? If we are still teaching formalized grammar, why? Can we honestly say that a student picking out subordinate clauses correctly from a hundred sentences will himself create sentences that demonstrate a more subtle use of idea subordination? Are we giving the best kind of final examination? To what extent have we experimented with testing to make it a learning situation for the students? What can we do to encourage visits from other schools and other members of our department? How much of our program produces people who will read more discriminatingly as adults or be able to express themselves articulately on some of those important occasions when the right word brings the flash of understanding? To what extent are we still teaching for some nebulous standard which we imagine the universities impose on us? Since many of our students will not go to university at all, what are they getting from us? Will they always depend on critics for their reactions to reading? Have they tools for research? Have they, through us, learned self-discipline and, what counts most of all, to be self-impelled?

The Role of the Department Chairman in Curriculum Development

Josephine Martin
English Department Chairman
Pine Bluff High School
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

The term department chairman ideally refers to that teacher who has been appointed to a position as leader of the English teachers in the school or the system and allowed sufficient time to work with them. Unfortunately, the chairman is often little more than a teacher with seniority, a teacher accepted casually by the school administration and given little time to undertake added responsibilities. The effective chairman's area of responsibility is fairly clearly defined. He is secure in his job and can reasonably expect that his present hopes may materialize, or change to better hopes, if not this year, in the not impossible future. He is a person, too, who, though he teaches classes—and he must teach classes—thinks in terms of the department as a whole and to some extent in terms of the total school program.

The term curriculum is interpreted broadly here as everything that takes place in the year to year teaching of students. Its development means many things, beginning perhaps with small groups sharing ideas and methods in their dedication to common aims. Such development was worked out in our department when we initially decided to abandon formal textbook teaching for emphasis on the language arts, with free choice of material. Our department chairman at that time had returned from a workshop conducted by Lou LaBrant and had inspired the rest of us, only three in number, with the enthusiasm she had received. No doubt Dr. LaBrant was saying then the sort of thing that she later wrote in the *English Journal*, "Planning a course in English should be a soul searching process, not accomplished by adding together bits of what others have done."[1] The four of us met in late summer, without pay, and planned our introductory activities. The time was shortly before the United States entered World War II, and we decided that every class would begin the year with a thematic unit to which we privately referred as "God Bless America." We thought we couldn't fail, and we didn't.

For material we used the few books we had bought with the inadequate fee substituted for student-owned texts, but chiefly we searched libraries and drew on our own and our students' ingenuity. Though we teachers shared our ideas and our findings, no two classes developed identical units. Unfortunately, not one unit was ever put into writing, nor was one ever repeated. After that experience, however, none of us yearned for the security of anthologies.

---

[1] Lou LaBrant, "As of Now," *English Journal*, XLVIII (September, 1959), 296.

That was curriculum development in its simplest form, highly personal, with teachers and students all deeply involved. Such activity could hardly develop throughout a department much larger than ours was at the time, but the spark, the rapport, the sharing at its base were fundamental to sound curriculum development.

With such a base of shared objectives and activities, the more formal type of curriculum development, which ultimately results in a carefully worded course of study, is a meaningful expression of the philosophy and aims of teachers committed to a common purpose.

Now what does this department chairman, secure in his function as a leader of English teachers, need to know before planning a sequential program? Of course, there is obvious knowledge. The chairman must know the social backgrounds of his students, the expectations of the community, and certainly the percentage of graduates who will go to college and the kinds of English programs they will find there. If this knowledge only makes him ask as the NCTE Committee on High School-College Articulation did, "But what are we articulating with?"[8] it still must be asked. If the answer reflects, as the committee indicated, "vast uncertainty about aims, about content, and about methods,"[9] it must be faced. Knowing of the uncertainty is better than gearing one's program to the expectations of one college or university, no matter how great its prestige.

In the local situation, too, the chairman must be familiar with the overall administrative policy as it concerns the language arts program. He must know what is being done on grade levels below his own. If there is a state or regional study guide, he should know to what extent his department is bound by it.

It was not this kind of knowledge, however necessary it is, that concerned Pine Bluff. A poll of our teachers emphasized the need for the chairman to be familiar with recent scholarship in the teaching of English, and, to some extent, to be able to evaluate such trends, especially in liberalizing and deepening the teaching of literature and in incorporating into the teaching of language and grammar the findings of structural linguists. Teachers have a right to expect their chairman to read carefully articles in the *English Journal*, to try to find out where other schools have succeeded or failed, to attend state and national meetings of English teachers, and to weigh all in the light of the local situation.

The chairman must also have a knowledge of people, for while striving to improve the English program, he works with the human beings who implement it. He must try to understand his colleagues, perhaps even the superintendent and the curriculum director. Possibly his greatest problem is in realizing they must have the total school program as the center of their plans. In working with teachers, the chairman will be surprised at some of their prejudices, disturbed by the desire of some to dominate, annoyed by the complacency of others, and perhaps equally deceived with equal frequency by an apparent antagonism and avowed cooperation. But he will be amazed by the understanding and loyalty of his colleagues once they realize that no small clique is "running the department" and that the chairman is trying to understand all points of view. Obviously the chairman gets this knowledge faster by being a friend and assisting graciously than by being a critic.

---

[8] Committee on High School-College Articulation, "But What Are We Articulating *With? Freshman English in Ninety-five Colleges and Universities*," *English Journal*, LI (March 1962), 167-169.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

These things the department chairman knows, but he does not just know; he does. And practically everything he does is a part of basic curriculum development, though some of these activities could just as well be called supervision or promotion of inservice education.

He visits a class where the teacher's technique for a particular activity is unusually good. He asks the teacher to describe the activity at the next departmental meeting or prepare a written description for circulation. He works with a committee to plan a regular departmental meeting, which will be an occasion for exchange of ideas and techniques.

The subject of descriptive grammar is not easily settled on a departmental level. Some teachers have heard nationally known speakers at state meetings and workshops. One or two have had summer courses, and a number are studying independently. Some are relatively uninformed and a few frankly skeptical. But nobody is indifferent. This fairly typical situation can be met in one of several ways: by an extension course from a teachers college in the area, by a local program in which better informed teachers teach uninformed teachers, by visits to a school that has made progress in this field, by bringing in several teachers from such a school for a workshop.

Activities of the chairman described so far have been largely general and inspirational. These are most important in improving instruction and in helping all teachers to realize that their classes are a part of the whole English curriculum. The most pressing need, however, is to get the basic agreements among teachers into written form. How is this somewhat formal project to be financed? In some schools, there is no problem because teachers receive additional pay during vacation weeks and allotments are reserved for consultants. (My personal belief is that consultants can help more in the preliminary inspirational sessions than in the actual writing of the course of study.) Perhaps, too, teachers will be given some released time during the school term for committee work. In many schools, unfortunately, the whole process will have to be conducted on a very limited budget. Probably the chairman, primarily, will influence those who control this budget. Only if the work of teachers is understood, only if there is a free channel of communication between those who do the work and those who control the pay can the English department expect financial support adequate for the type of planning and teaching assumed in this paper. Whatever the financial and time arrangements, I can conceive of no curriculum development that will not consume a great deal of teacher time and talent.

The chairman must foster a democratic atmosphere if fruitful writing is to result. All teachers should feel that they have helped. If they can feel that they are merely putting into definite form principles and practices that they have been following and hopes that they have for the future, so much the better. The size of the department can pose an organization problem. With only six or seven teachers, all could participate in the sessions but most English departments are too large to make such participation practical.

A small group, perhaps five, including teachers of different grade levels and different types of classes, could form the central committee. Perhaps the chairman should head this committee; but certainly not, if it is interpreted as dictatorship. However, the chairman must meet with the committee and should not hesitate to express his ideas. Before any subcommittees are formed, the central committee should formulate a philosophy and submit it to the department for discussion and acceptance before further details are studied. Any such statement must state clearly its interpretation of English, its recognition of the subject matter of English, and the attitudes and goals of teaching. It should be a philosophy, a statement flexible enough to help teachers to work out their own ways to implement it. As Floyd Rinker, Executive Director of the Commission on English, writes, "The essential learning in English takes place in the unique interaction of each teacher with each student. Any course of study that might limit, rather than expand that interaction, seems to be less an advantage than a threat."[4] Finally, the philosophy should be phrased in language worthy of teachers of language.

Working under the central committee should be equally representative subcommittees, composed of all members of the department. Each committee should consider what teachers in the department are already doing what seems good and measure these things by the best practices they can find. Perhaps the best single instrument for evaluation is the check list prepared by Dwight L. Burton and his Council committee,[5] but the committee will want to use ideas from currently working groups. Suppose, for example, that all students at one grade level are required to use identical textbooks. Does this mean that all classes must use all material in the texts? Are anthologies required? Is there no way to acquire paperbacks to liven the program? Can individual reading not be stressed?

Or let us look at the committee working on language and grammar, where we must consider modern approaches. Insistence that all teachers use it will only antagonize the still reluctant. Permissiveness will, we hope, lead to growth in this area, and, if the inservice education has been effective, there will be encouraging results. Many teachers have been won by the ability of the "new grammar" to clarify certain rules that have raised problems for themselves and students. This enables them to appreciate the larger, more accurate concepts of language that are its base.

---

[4] Floyd Rinker, "Things Are Stirring in English," *College Board Review*, 53 (Spring 1964), 41.

[5] Commission on the Curriculum, "A Check List for Evaluating the English Program in the Junior and Senior High School," *English Journal*, LI (April 1962), 273-282.

Problems with reading and literature have been touched on earlier. In view of what is being done with contemporary material and with so-called "difficult" reading in high school, it is both unrealistic and unimaginative for teachers and students to spend much time talking about writers and discussing fragments from their works. The real challenge is to comprehend the full meaning of a writer's work, reading complete selections and reading them fully, and to come to see some of the writer's artistry. How can the department head and the committee working on this area help teachers?

First, they can encourage real communication of teacher and pupil about literature. They can help the teacher have the confidence to entertain an idea different from his own, which of course promotes a lively class discussion. They can file lists of articles perhaps from the *English Journal*, that will spark the teaching of particular writings or writers. They can build a departmental library of books to help teachers to understand and present the works of such writers as Conrad, Eliot, and Faulkner. They can promote an active exchange of findings among teachers. They can build a pamphlet and clipping file. They can realize that younger teachers, with their recent experiences in college classrooms, can help older teachers.

And above all, the chairman and all teachers can–and must–read and read and read. Teachers who read with enthusiasm will naturally talk to others in the department about their reading. A department whose members know something about each other's reading tastes, one in which students know which teacher is the Salinger fan, which one Browning or Emerson, or which one enjoys building units around articles in *Harper's* and the *Atlantic* is one in which literature is alive.

This enthusiasm should extend, too, to the student's individual reading and his response to it. The old practice of requiring book reports at planned intervals, often on books from an extremely limited list, has virtually disappeared. But the gains we have made must be supported by intelligent, resourceful ideas to direct students toward the right books at the right time, to offer sincere response, and to encourage them to share their reading impressions.

In the kind of department where reading is as real as I have tried to picture it, teachers can develop out of these reading discusssions vital experiences in speaking and writing, the kind of speaking and writing in which the student knows that the teacher will be expecting him to have something to say, will be looking for straight thinking and sensible organization as well as for clarity of expression and accuracy of usage. Indeed much that has been said about helping the teacher to develop a true interest in literature can be done for writing and, to some extent, for speaking.

If we assume that our committees working on the course of study, in addition to all the work already mentioned, have provided for lists of recommended reading suitable for every reader, a section of information needed by new teachers, and an explanation of forms and routine matters to simplify the operation of the department, we are ready for each subcommittee to report to the central committee. Then the entire department will consider the course of study.

So then, it is finished, you say. No indeed. It is never finished. Parts are already obsolescent, so that, though the project has taken years, it is going to need almost constant revision. It is, however, ready to be used, as indeed it has been used and made simultaneously, and this use will reveal more needs for its improvement. Parts of it should be explained to the faculty as a whole, and certainly its philosophy and its relevance to education today should be interpreted to administrators and to school board members, who, therefore, may support the English program out of conviction.

The Chairman's Role in Selecting Textbooks and Library Books

Nell H. Thomas
English Department Chairman
Greenville High School
Greenville, Mississippi

If a magic wand were available to chairmen of English departments, it should first be exercised selecting the basic tool of their program—books. Since most chairmen are without wand, they must seek more realistic ways of meeting this departmental responsibility.

Just what is the chairman's role in selecting textbooks? Certainly providing guidance in selecting books and purposeful directions in the use of such books should be expected of the chairman. To supplement the adopted texts, the chairman should suggest a variety of inexpensive materials that will both enrich the program and ensure its flexibility.

To offer intelligently informed guidance—there's the rub! To examine minutely every literature anthology and every grammar and composition textbook on the market would be an overwhelming task for any English teacher, especially since publishers tend to revise their salable textbooks once every five years. But for school systems not bound by state adoptions unless some short cut can be devised, such examinations are necessary.

Recognizing the work to be done in selecting texts, the Council for Basic Education has recently sponsored a "comprehensive study" of English textbooks (72 literature anthologies and 14 sets of grammar texts for grades 9-12) used in some 200 cities and towns are reported by state departments of education and superintendents of schools.[1] In his review of the book, Arno Jewett, though deploring several of its deficiencies, suggests that the book "deserves the critical attention of high school English teachers and principals."[2] It should offer the beginnings of a short cut for weighing the merits of textbooks.

In addition, a chairman could initiate a similar critical evaluation within his own department. Assigning certain books to each staff member could reduce the load for the chairman as well as involve the whole department in the selection process. A detailed review of each book if duplicated and distributed to members of the department could be considered and evaluated at specified department meetings. English associations organized on a county, district, or even statewide basis, could use the same procedure.

---

[1] James J. Lynch and Bertrand Evans, *High School English Textbooks* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1963).

[2] Arno Jewett, "A Critical Review of *High School English Textbooks*," *Bulletin of NASSP*, XLVII (February 1964), 129-134.

Where state adoptions are practiced, more than comprehensive evaluations would be involved. Whether that adoption is single or multiple (as in Mississippi where three literature and three grammar books are adopted every six years), the appointment of the most competent professional personnel to the rating committee would be the first prerequisite. In Mississippi, and in other states, such professional appointment is no foregone certainty. A recent Mississippi law now empowers the governor to appoint four of the seven-member rating committee and the state superintendent of education to appoint three. In previous adoptions the state superintendent appointed all seven members. Needless to say, pressure groups exerting influence upon the state legislature effected this change. Nevertheless, English associations throughout the state have refused to become politically inactive on this issue, owing to their cognizance of the disaster ahead should the committee fall into the hands of extremist groups. They know that effective books for their programs might no longer be secured as a result.

In the event that the state rating committee is composed of outstanding English teachers, rather than political appointees, the staff will be ready to choose from the multiple list the best literature and the best grammar-composition text to implement the school's philosophy.

However, a department philosophy—its objectives, its curriculum offerings, and courses of study, demand careful planning for follow-through. In the past, to give purposeful, meaningful direction to a follow-through by the staff was most exacting on the chairman's time and energy. Today, so much material is available that a chairman can become completely frustrated in the culling process alone. The chairman can, however, direct his staff in the use of manuals or teachers' guides; furthermore he can lead in the formulation of manuals appropriate to his English program. Not completely satisfied with the content and the cost of available term paper bulletins, the Greenville High School English Department has printed its own and is now in the process of compiling material for guides in the teaching of selected novels and short stories.

In addition, the National Council of Teachers of English provides an unlimited supply of instructional aids: the *English Journal* and *College English* carry many informative and creative ideas for instruction. Besides a monthly listing of current publications in the journals, NCTE supplies annually a pamphlet, *Resources for the Teaching of English*, which catalogs instructional materials available from NCTE. From these a chairman could lay the foundations for a professional library. But, of course, even a professional library and the best textbooks, enriched by manuals, is no "be all and end all"; thus much more supplementary material must be made available to both teachers and students. A local central depository of sets of all desirable textbooks, such as is available in some California districts, would be utopia. Greenville High School has found representatives for publishing houses willing to supply several complimentary copies of their newest books. Collections have been made of these to be checked out to staff members for reference. Also the Mississippi depository is very cooperative in issuing to schools out-dated (the previous adoption) books in large numbers if they are requested. Since revisions in some books are only minimal, this service allows schools to have on hand as many as three texts at a time.

Discussion of supplemental materials would be incomplete without mention of the paperback. The feasibility of using paperbacks in standard textbook adoptions might be considered by publishing houses and state departments of education. The reduced cost of such books could allow for an increase in range of choice in single and multiple adoption states, thereby permitting English departments to equip themselves more adequately in providing for individual differences. Because innumerable paperbacks are currently on the market, orders need to be coordinated. The English department therefore works closely with the library staff for these purchases. English teachers, by grade level and subsequently by department, review complete novels, dramas, collections of short stories and essays which will be taught each school session. A school population at Greenville of approximately 1500 permits ability groupings and at the same time demands a staff to reach a consensus on reading choices compatible with the reading level of each group.

For parallel reading (six required books for average groups), the English department and the librarians work closely in compiling for each grade level three basic book lists (below average, average, and advanced). Because many students prefer personal copies, the librarians place several orders of paperbacks during the year.

But the library has a greater function in the English program than that of supplying and housing a professional library, assisting in preparing book lists, and ordering and selling paperbacks for the department. It is one of the life lines of the program. To assure both themselves and the librarians that the students are fully aware of the wealth of material in the library and the most efficient and expeditious ways to use it, English teachers reserve a week of class time during the first six weeks for a freshman orientation period directed by the librarians. Each subsequent grade level usually has a two- to three-day review of the library, especially noting any new additions. Then each English teacher may schedule class periods for work in the library, to avoid overcrowding the facilities and overloading the librarians.

Equipping the library with sufficient materials for a comprehensive English program is also a cooperative venture by both the library and the English department. Both the H. W. Wilson *Standard Catalog for High School* and the *ALA Basic Book Collection for High Schools* (1964) have been the criteria used in satisfying the minimum needs of Greenville High School. Then both departments are continually alert for titles to supplement the basic collection. NCTE's *College and Adult Reading List of Books in Literature and the Fine Arts*, Clifton Fadiman's *Lifetime Reading Plan* and Weber's *Good Reading* (sponsored by College English Association) provide extensive lists for more standard selections; *ALA's Booklist, Library Journal,* and the book review sections of the *New York Times* and other reliable periodicals provide titles for current additions; and *Books for You,* an NCTE publication, offers "a wide variety of titles for practically every reading taste." Both staffs have found Books on Exhibit, a national display operation of new library books each year from some fifty publishers, "preeminent and indispensable, in so far as it makes a definitive job of book selection possible . . . with a minimum expenditure of time and effort."

As for reference books, the basic guides have already supplied the library with the regulars: *Cambridge History of English Literature* (and American); Spiller *et al., Literary History of the United States;* Baugh *et al., A Literary History of England; Dictionary of American Biography; Dictionary of National Biography;* Kunitz and Haycraft biographical collections; *Current Biography;* etc. Each English teacher and each librarian has committed herself to recommending additional books. The department chairman takes a minimum of two hours of browsing time in the reference area of the library of every high school and college in or out of state that she visits. Funds appropriated for one staff member each year to attend the NCTE convention enable one additional teacher to experience that "shot in the arm" through exchanging information with colleagues from schools across the nation. Likewise the librarians attend state and national meetings, hold conferences with book salesmen, and read advertising brochures. Perhaps the "discovery" of Perma-Bound books for reference and circulation was last year's outstanding contribution from such efforts.

Despite maximum planning in selecting textbooks and supplementary materials and despite laborious efforts in providing directions for their best use, a chairman may also have to cope with staff or parental complaints about the choices. Perhaps the most effective method of offsetting staff complaints is a preventive one: teachers who are involved in the selecting process and the planning procedures rarely continue to pose problems.

As for parental complaints, if they are limited to choice of textbooks and library books, a chairman has two courses of action: (1) reexamination of the targets to determine whether the criticism is valid (from which appropriate modifications should ensue), and (2) consideration of some method for establishing confidence in the staff and the English program. The latter course is already achieved in communities of no more than 50,000 where a staff member's contributions in civic areas outside are usually well known and applauded. Respect in these areas generally will cause him to be confident in his major function—teaching. In larger communities all channels of communication will need exploring and opening—the PTA, mass communication *(Mr. Novak),* and the like. However, the major breeding ground for criticism appears to lie in lack of confidence. Have English teachers themselves encouraged unwarranted criticism? Have they told the "English story" to each other but failed to tell the public? For instance, does the public know that Project English is underway? Is the Madison Avenue "hard sell" approach in order now?

These then constitute the chairman's responsibility in selecting books: guidance in selecting books and direction in the use of them; close cooperation with librarians in acquiring and using supplementary materials; and, last, leadership in handling departmental and parental dissatisfactions with book choices.

But still the questions of greatest import remain unanswered. Do the students at Greenville High School read? Does their reading evidence a degree of breadth and depth? And, if so, how has this interest in reading been achieved? The answer to the first two questions is a happy, emphatic yes. That reading is once again in good repute is seen throughout the system: ownership of a paperback is the status symbol at Greenville High. If the student is knowledgeable about its contents, he increases his esteem among peers. For the past two years the sales of paperbacks in the school library alone have approximated 4,000 copies annually, exclusive of hundreds purchased at local and out-of-town book stands and on college campuses. Contrary to usual expectations, circulation of library books has risen almost as if paperbacks have primed the pump. That the books are read is shown of course in the classroom, in the keen competition for a place on the Literary Bowl teams, and in a general enthusiastic response toward the Library Bowl Assembly Program. This annual library sponsored program patterned after the television *College Bowl* has become the No. 1 favorite with the students. In addition several senior classes have endowed the library generously to supplement budgeted funds for binding periodicals, and the 1962-63 class presented the library with the Great Books collection.

Now, how has this interest in reading been achieved? We do know that there are a number of contributing forces at work:

1. Enthusiastic English and library staffs dedicated to promoting the reading program;
2. An enlightened, cooperative administration convinced that reading is basic to the total educational process and willing to underwrite the cost of it;
3. Able student leaders ready to accept the role of leading the student body toward the most effective school program;
4. A literary-minded community often dubbed "the Athens of the South" that has set a climate in which writers can flourish and where their works are read (William Alexander Percy, David Cohn, Hodding Carter, Shelby Foote, Ellen Douglas, Charles Bell—to name a few);
5. A nationwide renaissance in reading emanating apparently from a reemphasis on the three R's. An able student working to his capacity now has status. The library has again become the focal point of activity.

Disseminating Results of New Research in English

Frank M. Rice
Codirector of the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center
University of Nebraska

In the dissemination of results of research in English, the department chairman plays several roles. He serves as a liaison between professional organizations and teachers, between researchers and the local curriculum, between publishing companies on one hand and the curriculum and teachers of his school on the other hand. At times his leadership role resembles that of a Machiavelli or a Mussolini. If he wants to make the English curriculum flexible, responsive to new discoveries, and teaching practices consistent with the best pedagogical practices, he must deal with the personalities of both administrative and teaching staff of his school, influence them to make radical changes in the curriculum, to conduct experimental programs, and to provide money for the new materials or aids which an experimental curriculum requires. In addition, he must influence his staff to inform themselves of the best discoveries in research, to adapt these discoveries to their own teaching practices, and to work at getting acquainted with new materials.

From 1950 through 1962, I was chairman of the English department at Omaha Central High School. Although I never achieved completely the ideal program and teaching practices which appear to keep abreast of good, contemporary trends, I was not altogether unsuccessful either. I shall describe how I tried to fulfill the several roles of a department chairman.

First, I informed myself of significant new research in curriculum and teaching practices. Even though I communicated directly with people involved in interesting research, I gained most of my information by reading the publications of professional organizations, in which I found the implications of research filtered through the thinking and practices of leading members of the English teaching profession. As a person in a responsible position, I had to guard against professional publications; I sorted the significant from the ephemeral. It was only when the results of research were treated several times in the publications and continued to grow in interest among members of the profession that I felt confident to involve my school.

For several years two areas of research represented in professional publications again and again occupied my attention and engaged my energies. One was the growing field of linguistics and its implications for a new curriculum of language. The other was the New Criticism, the movement which advocated a close reading of text and the reading of a few complete selections as opposed to the reading of short excerpts from a great many selections. The increasing popularity of these areas, as evidenced by numerous articles and school programs, convinced me that the Central High School English teachers should be concerned and should prepare to revise their curricula and teaching practices. More and more articles dealing with them appeared in professional publications: *English Journal, College English, College Composition and Communication. Abstracts of English Studies* directed me to many other publications that offered useful information respecting these two areas.

I had read some of the early writers on linguistics: S. A. Leonard's work on usage, Bloomfield's *Language*, the NCTE publication of Fries' research in 1940, and the writings of Whitehall, Henry Lee Smith, Jr., Lloyd and Warfel, Roberts. In 1956 Roberts had published his *Patterns of English*, the first linguistic grammar for secondary schools. At the NCTE convention of 1958, I saw a group of students from the University of Minnesota High School demonstrate a lesson in syntax, and this was convincing evidence that high school students could master the new approach to language learning. Furthermore, I had corresponded with a teacher in Connecticut, who was initiating linguistics into the curriculum of her junior high school. These experiences convinced me that Central High School should also be concerned with this area.

Similarly, it became evident that the literature program should be changed. The inauguration of the Advanced Placement Program outmoded our dependence on the anthology. The first booklet issued by this organization gave sample syllabi of good literature courses and representative questions which students of literature might be expected to discuss or to write about. This booklet pointed out that the historical and autobiographical information and the study of snippets from major works were peripheral and must give way to close reading. The Commission on English, College Entrance Examination Board, issued its *End-of-Year Examinations in English for College-bound Students, Grades 9-12.* This offered convincing evidence that the literature curriculum of Central High School needed a wholesale overhauling to bring it into line with the best practices of the day for the college-bound.

Now that the direction of change was clear to me, it was my duty to interest the total staff—or at least enough of the staff to get change underway. Although the teachers were already working very hard, I knew that in order to teach a new program, they had to be involved in designing it and, as preparation, needed to do a considerable amount of reading and thinking.

My role as Mussolini came when membership in the Nebraska Council and the National Council was considered. I urged—almost commanded—teachers to join.

In a sense a department chairman must be Machiavellian in making subtle demands on hardworking teachers. My approach had to be an oblique one since I could not demand of hardworking teachers what would appear to be a very large job and an imposition on their very limited free state. My first maneuver was to get the principal to purchase approximately fifteen of the most reliable works on linguistics. These I displayed on a shelf in the department office. With them I placed several articles from professional publications, which dealt with various schools which had initiated the teaching of linguistics in their English departments. Whenever a teacher showed an interest in one of the books, I urged him to read it or to read at least a few of the most important chapters. When the teacher had finished with the book, I usually tried to steer him to another. When two teachers had read the same book, I found an informal occasion when I could involve them in a discussion of the book. As discussions among the teachers grew and some expressed a curiosity to experiment with the teaching of linguistics to their classes, I took them at their word, persuaded the principal to buy several sets of Roberts' *English Sentences*, and helped them get started. Since I left Central High School, more and more teachers are beginning to teach linguistics. Now that Central High School is one of the pilot schools of the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center and is teaching the new Nebraska Curriculum in selected classrooms (9 through 12), linguistics is becoming accepted by more teachers in the school. Since one teacher has discovered that this type of language teaching is more successful with slow students than traditional grammar was, other teachers are using linguistics.

Besides keeping myself informed of new research in English curricula and teaching practices by reading the professional publications, I found that attendance at conventions was also a way of keeping in touch with new developments.

Although the policy of the school was not to pay any part of the expenses of a teacher attending a convention, I usually managed to have the money to attend the NCTE convention each year. Very few of the staff would attend mainly because they were unwilling, or even unable, to pay their own expenses. If the convention was held in a midwestern city, such as St. Louis or Chicago, one or two of the staff would attend, and I always made it a point to give those who attended an opportunity to report to the rest what they had learned from the speakers and from their informal association with other teachers. When I was the only one who had attended the convention, I would circulate whatever articles and other materials I had brought back, and would in informal conversations try to communicate the major concerns of the convention. Even though one can never quite communicate the strong spirit of the convention to those who did not attend—reports of experimental work, of research, of new pedagogy, of the importance of the English teacher—he could stimulate enough interest among his staff so that when the significant speeches of the convention later appeared in the *English Journal* or *College English*, the staff would read these. Occasionally I would ask a panel of teachers to read certain articles and discuss them at department meetings.

Challenging leaflets and articles plant many worthwhile ideas in the department. Occasionally, I distributed copies of interesting articles or useful kinds of teaching aids in sufficient numbers for teachers to have one for each student in their classes. Some of these were one-day teaching devices which, if the teacher followed them, often yielded insight into better ways of teaching certain skills or concepts. Others opened up much larger vistas of curriculum or practices. Sometimes such bulletins reported interesting research. Others dealt with ways of evaluating compositions, teaching punctuation and spelling, improving powers of interpreting literature.

The relationship established between a local college or university and the high school is one of the most effective means by which the results of research can be disseminated among the teachers of a school and become an integral part of their curriculum and their teaching practices. During my participation on the curriculum committee of the Nebraska Council, I learned that members of the University of Nebraska English faculty were eager to be useful to schools. During the first semester of the following year, we invited four members of the University staff to talk to and to work with Central High School English teachers, and we invited staffs from other schools in the city to participate. The University staff were helpful in alerting all teachers to the need to improve English curricula and to change many of our teaching practices.

Obviously, the University staff could bring to the teachers much more authoritative information than I could muster. Their staff provided a linguist who traced for us the development of linguistics during the past half century and showed us the inadequacies of traditional grammar, a literary specialist in the myth and the epic, an expert in the close reading of lyric poetry, and the person responsible for the freshman English program at the University eager to coordinate his work with the high school teachers' work. Furthermore, University faculty members had worked with the Nebraska Council Curriculum Committee during the preceding summer. They had great respect for the abilities and the knowledge of elementary and secondary school teachers; they had also learned a great deal about the nature of the precollege English program. In addition to sharing his own knowledge with his staff, the department chairman cannot miss local opportunities such as these to give his teachers direct contact with specialists in particular aspects of the teaching of English.

The Role of the Chairman in Evaluating the Program and in Maintaining Sequence

Clarence W. Hach
English Department Chairman
Evanston Township High School

Evaluation of an English program and maintenance of sequence in it seem to me to be extremely important roles of an English department chairman, yet roles which few of us have assumed for at least two important reasons: (1) objective evaluation of much of an English program is difficult at best, and (2) traditionally there has been no real sequence in English.

Yet evaluation and sequence are inextricably related because evaluation implies that there is a program in English to evaluate, and a program implies that there is a sequence. True evaluation, then, ought to be based on certain clearly defined goals in the various areas of English for each grade level, goals which in one sense, of course, should be the same for all youth, yet in another sense also different in consideration of individual differences.

To maintain sequence, then, a department chairman will, with the help of his department, need first to create a sequence that is based on the structures inherent in language, composition, and literature; upon the educational and psychological interests of youth at the various age and grade levels; and upon the laws of learning. When that sequence has been established and teachers know their limitations and responsibilities in teaching it at a particular grade and ability level, then a program of evaluation can be evolved.

Many leaders of English education have said that the humanities have not shown the same sense of responsibility as the sciences (and I might add mathematics and foreign languages) in putting their academic house in order, and Dwight L. Burton, past editor of the *English Journal*, has said that "in most other fields in the high school curriculum, the student progresses from one clearcut course to another: from algebra to plane geometry to trigonometry; from general science to biology to chemistry to physics; from typing to shorthand to bookkeeping." We English department chairmen must do more to put our academic house in order so that students will sense some order and progression in English as they do in other subjects and that English every year, in Dwight

Burton's words, will not be "the same old thing—the same old grammar, same old book reports, same old theme topics."[1]

To create order and sequence which will make possible a pupil's mastering English equal his potentiality, we must, in the words of Edgar Dale of Ohio State University, "map the field, note its basic principles, its key ideas, its conceptual structure."[2] We department chairmen and our teachers have until very recently never done very much thinking along these lines, and most English courses are still largely collections of composition and literature with very little language study other than traditional grammar.

Our traditional American and English literature courses are also classic examples of ignoring sequence based on interests and principles of learning, for usually that which is most remote from pupils' interest is taught first and that which is closest is taught last. The only usual order in these courses is chronological, certainly the least significant in terms of teaching and learning.

In composition pupils have simply written. There has been no real program at all, one that recognizes learning to write as a slow, gradual process involving simpler types of compositions as preliminary steps to more difficult ones, one that includes a variety of compositions, one that requires that composition be taught, not just assigned.

In language there has been little except grammar and that practically the same every year. Few schools have had a program that has attempted to avoid in the words of Robert C. Pooley "too much grammar, too early, too fast."[3] Most teachers unfortunately, either have taught nearly all grammar every year or taught very little.

If a dreary picture has been drawn of our subject as it has been taught and is still being taught in too many places, we must realistically seek to improve English instruction and consider evaluation of our English program and maintenance of sequence.

First, then, before evaluating an English program and maintaining sequence, we need to "map the field," as Edgar Dale says, and create a program based upon the nature of our subject and upon the laws of learning. We need to organize our subject so that our teaching of it, in the words of Jerome Bruner in *The Process of Education,* may "cultivate excellence," which to him means emphasizing the structure of a subject, which he says is "even more valuable for the less able than for the gifted one" because the less able "is most easily thrown off the track by poor teaching."[4]

What would such a program be like? Though there are other areas important in an English program besides what has come to be known currently as the tripod of our subject—language, composition, and literature—it's these areas, of course, that constitute our chief subject matter.

---

[1] Dwight L. Burton, "Trailing Clouds of Boredom Do They Come," *English Journal,* LI (April 1962), 260.

[2] Edgar Dale, "Learning to Learn," *The News Letter,* XXVIII (May 1963), 1. This is a publication of Bureau of Educational Resources and Service, Ohio State University.

[3] Robert C. Pooley, *Teaching English Grammar* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), p. 133.

[4] Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

In the grammar part of the language tripod we need a sequence that reflects the research of B. F. Skinner, on which much of programed learning is based, and Jerome Bruner, and upon the ideas of Robert C. Pooley. Whatever kind of grammar is to be taught—traditional, structural, or transformational—we need a clearly defined program that probably starts formal teaching of grammar in grade seven, that provides for teaching of some new aspects of grammar each year, and that for purposes of evaluation requires a series of diagnostic and mastery tests related to the program or course of study so that there can be testing as an integral part of teaching. I believe that if a school system has a clearly defined program in grammar for grades 7-12 it can evolve both diagnostic and mastery tests of its own geared to his course of study. If grammar were first taught formally in grade seven, then the first department mastery test should be given perhaps in early April so as to allow for reteaching—or, as Bruner says, reinforcement. Such a test would need to be prepared to allow for easy item analysis and would need to test formal knowledge of grammar as well as application of it.

Along with mastery tests, which should be cumulative, to be given at each grade level at about the same time each spring, there should be a system of diagnostic tests, also cumulative, given early in the fall at each grade level except the seventh so that a teacher may know the capabilities of each class in grammar and so that he may arrange for some reteaching of grammar of preceding years.

If the concepts of grammar are arranged on a continuum that parallels a pupil's growth in language maturity and accords with the basic structures of our language, then we shall have evidence of the fact that, as Mr. Pooley says, "maturity is another way of saying slowly developing and expanding abilities and that growth in the grasp of grammatical concepts is slow and gradual, rather than rapid and immediate."

If a school is large enough to have ability grouping, then reteaching parts of grammar not yet mastered may be easier in a particular class because there is likely to be less range in the number and type of errors, certainly in accelerated groups, then in purely heterogeneous classes. With programed materials becoming available, arrangements for reteaching, not only of grammar but also of other so-called mechanics, will be easier to handle in both homogeneous and heterogeneous classes.

To obtain information on the teaching of grammar and so-called mechanics in a department, the department chairman could ask teachers for scores of each diagnostic and mastery test given. The chairman then could prepare bell shaped curves for each grade level, even each ability group, to show the range of scores, and he could keep these records to use for comparative purposes in subsequent years. If there were areas of real weakness or strength in certain classes not closely identified with ability groups, the chairman could then look into the situation to determine the reason for weakness or strength.

If the teaching of grammar and mechanics were closely related to composition so that a new concept could be applied immediately to writing, and if the marking of compositions would parallel the course of study in grammar and mechanics so that errors made in concepts not yet studied would not be marked for all pupils and certainly not counted off for pupils on whose papers the errors were marked, then, too, there could be tangible evidence in composition of pupil mastery of grammar and mechanics. Individual teachers could study sets of papers at various times during the school year to correlate errors their pupils make with the course of study.

An entire department could also be organized to make a study either by devoting a monthly meeting or an institute day to the comparison of compositions. A department would need to have a policy of requiring that themes be filed throughout a school year. Though we know that the elimination of errors and the development of a mature sentence sense are slow, gradual processes at best, we could and should have some tangible evidence of progress being made by individual pupils.

A system devised by Paul O'Dea of the University of Chicago Laboratory School of using 5" x 8" index cards on which pupils record their chief weaknesses when themes are returned to them is another, perhaps even easier, method for a teacher and a department chairman to observe individual pupil progress in overcoming weaknesses in grammar and mechanics, as well as other even more important composition problems. In Mr. O'Dea's system, since not all errors are marked on papers, a pupil can record on his index card his chief weaknesses and review that card both prior to and after writing his next theme. Conscious awareness of a particular problem or problems does much to help pupils avoid these problems in subsequent papers. A teacher's or a department chairman's study of a series of consecutive papers and index cards of a number of pupils will show what progress is being made in overcoming certain weaknesses.[5]

Of course a school should have a program in language that is broader than grammar and mechanics. Schools are beginning to initiate interesting and valuable language programs, such as lexicology, dialectology, and language history. They are beginning to revive the art of rhetoric as an integral part of English related to both composition and literature. Because of the importance of all of these areas of language study to both composition and literature, chairmen of departments should see that these areas of language study are being taught effectively at the various grade levels, and they should with department members evolve examinations related to the areas to be given during the school year and probably also all-department year-end examinations in the manner suggested by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board. Study of the booklet *End-of-Year Examinations in English for*

---

[5] Paul O'Dea, "Teaching Composition—One Thing at a Time," *Illinois English Bulletin*, January 1964.

College-bound Students Grades 9-12[6] will suggest the types of essay questions that can be evolved for the language part of the English tripod.

Ideas of sequence and structure can also be applied to composition where probably more work has been done in recent years to develop a program than in any other area of English. Most sequences are based on types of composition, moving from the paragraph in the junior high school to simple two- and three-paragraph expository themes to a simple five-paragraph theme on to more involved types of composition, such as argument, comparison and contrast, and definition to those involving cause and effect and analogy and in more advanced junior and senior classes to a combination of various types. Such a sequence is desirable if pupils are required to demonstrate some degree of competence in a simpler type before moving on to a more demanding form based on preceding types.

A department chairman must assume responsibility for instituting a program in composition based on sequence, and then he must through inservice training of new teachers see that they understand and follow the program. All teachers in his department must understand that ideally there has to be a sequence for each pupil—the ungraded classroom philosophy—and that each pupil after demonstrating control of a particular type of composition, must move on to the next more difficult type. His teachers must understand that sequence doesn't mean going from a descriptive paragraph this week to an expository paragraph next week and an argumentative paragraph the following. Sequence rather means stressing organization or development this week, organization or development next week, and probably organization or development again the following week.

How can a chairman see that his teachers observe sequence in composition? The best way is to have the teachers help to evolve a sequential program that they approve of, but this may not mean that the teacher will implement it in the classroom. The chairman's best check is to require that writing folders be kept for each pupil and that compositions be filed by order of assignments. Occasionally, the chairman can call for four or five folders to be sent to him the next day and read through them to determine whether the sequence for that grade level is being followed or, if not, whether a sensible sequence for that pupil is being substituted. He can also ascertain the nature of the teacher's writing assignments and his method of evaluation. The department chairman needs to have some such system as this one to know what his teachers are doing in composition. If some teachers are not following the department's program, he can then arrange a conference to discuss the matter. If he finds that a teacher is following the school's program and is doing an excellent job of teaching composition, he can tell the teacher so. In either case, the chairman will have specific evidence for a written evaluation of the teacher for professional advancement.

---

[6] Commission on English. *End-of-Year Examinations in English for College-bound Students Grades 9-12* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board 1964).

There should be a more objective method of evaluating a school's work in composition from the beginning to the end of a year and from grade level to grade level. Any system involving actual writing, of course, is cumbersome and expensive, involving as it does the employment and training of qualified outside readers or the use of already overworked faculty. Results, even then, are of somewhat doubtful value, according to studies made by the College Entrance Examination Board.

Indirect assessment of a pupils' writing ability can be made with a number of standardized effectiveness of expression tests, and a department probably should give different forms of some of these tests and use them to compare pupil growth in the area of writing, if not in actual composition. The STEP writing tests and those in effectiveness of expression of the Cooperative Test Division of the Educational Testing Service are usable for this purpose. We know from research conducted by ETS for the College Entrance Examination Board in its annual English Composition Test (ECT) that there can be a rather high correlation between a standardized test that measures compositional skills indirectly and a pupil's actual writing ability.

Evolving a sequence in literature is much more difficult than for language and composition because parts of literature cannot be isolated in the same way as can grammatical concepts or types of composition. Yet it is being done and must be done if we are to recognize learning as a growth process and if we are truly to prepare pupils to read increasingly mature literature. It is necessary, too, if we are to avoid teaching complex words before teaching easier ones and if we are to avoid introducing some pupils to extremely mature and involved words before they are ready or before they have the reading skills necessary to read them.

In evolving a program in literature we must be especially cognizant of the interests and abilities of our pupils and attempt to build a program that considers, besides the purposes of teaching literature at the various grade levels, the structural characteristics of literature. If literature is a subject matter, then there should be something progressive about the reading of literature. The following quotation from the *English Curriculum Guide*, 1962, of the Tamalpais Union High School District, Larkspur, California, seems to be one of the few that considers a progressive sequence in literature:

> This progression can be seen as a passing from the study of the relatively simple to the relatively complex, always keeping in mind the necessity for selecting important worthwhile works. The chief guidepost, of course, which helps to differentiate the simple from the complex is the movement from external to internal. If we apply this idea to such familiar aspects of literature as structure, character, theme and idea, we can see that in the simpler work the emphasis is on action, incident, physical conflict; the characters are delineated through a description of external details; the theme or thesis is explicitly stated; and the view of human nature is somewhat static and conventional. But in the more complex work the emphasis is on the symbolic, on recurring patterns and heightened moments of awareness; the characters are

> delineated through an investigation of their internal states; the theme is multiple and is myriad; and the mysterious, elusive quality of human nature is stressed.[7]

This quotation can be an excellent guide to help us choose short stories, drama, and novels and arrange them in a continuum from the easy to the most difficult in a total course of study and also at each grade level. We do need to analyze the characteristics of the literature we teach, to think of these characteristics in relationship to the pupils, and to see that there is growth and sequence from year to year for all ability groups.

According to the *Curriculum Guide* of the Tamalpais Union High School District, a sequential program in literature can be worked out by applying knowledge of various developmental stages. The *Guide* gives a brief general description of these stages, and then spells them out for the various genre for each grade level:

> In the first stage one studies works that have linear dramatic or narrative development, that stress incident and physical action or conflict, that have limited scope, and that depend on a central character for unity. The picaresque novel would be an example. The next stage is to widen the scope. This can be done in two ways: by studying works that are panoramic in intent, that contain a multiplicity of characters and depict a broad social complex; or by studying a variety of works that demonstrate the possibilities of a form. The third stage is to study works that intensify the aspects of reality depicted, works wherein character, incident, description mean more than their denotative value. The fourth stage is to study works that combine intensity with wide scope.[8]

If a school's literature program is organized in this way, then, of course, there is little problem for the chairman to maintain this sequence. Most sequences, if that word can be used at all, are based on whims of teachers, availability of books, or tradition, none of which I would classify as particularly sound pedagogy. Of course, in evolving a sequence in literature based on structural elements, we must also consider pupils' interests and pyschological needs, and the program evolved must reflect thinking in all three areas: pupils' interest, psychological needs, and structural elements.

Evaluation of a literature program is perhaps the most difficult of all areas to do. In fact, there is no way to satisfy test experts, for the real test of how well we teach literature is to observe whether our pupils read on their own, what they read, and how their behavior, both personal and social, is altered as a result of their reading. Teachers can require pupils to keep records of the books they read, no doubt should, and, if pupils are honest in their recording, it is possible to evaluate the variety and maturity level of both an individual pupil and a class. Department chairmen can study random samplings of these records and can do much to encourage teachers to stimulate "outside" reading and become real reading counselors to their pupils.

---

[7] *English Curriculum Guide*, Instructional Bulletin No. 6, 1962, Tamalpais Union High School District, Larkspur, California, 1962, p. 1.

[8] *Ibid.*

Department chairmen can also help teachers to get away from using for major tests in literature the kinds of questions that cover only literary information, identification of characters and speeches, understanding of plot, and literary history. They can encourage the use of essay questions which require pupils to use their knowledge of literature and apply it to new situations. Pupils should be required, for example, as a culmination to the study of poetry in any ability group at any grade level, to explicate poems not yet studied. To test growth in understanding and appreciating other genre, teachers can also see that tests over short stories, drama, and novels require pupils to apply their understanding of literary technique, character, and idea to a comparison between two or more works read, and in the case of character and idea, to people they know and the world about them.

Because teachers tend to emphasize what they test, department chairmen should strive to improve all testing (certainly major unit, semester, or year-end examinations in literature) through inservice training and by studying teachers' major examinations from time to time and by conferring with them. In fact, it is a good idea to have all major examinations turned in to the English office for filing. Nothing reflects the kind of teaching done in a classroom more than a teacher's major examinations.

Despite the difficulty of testing literature objectively, some departmental testing should be done to get fairly reliable objective scores and to compare pupils with one another at a particular grade level. *The Iowa Educational Development Tests on Ability to Interpret Literary Materials* and the *Literary Comprehension Tests* of Educational Testing Service are possibilities. These tests, though controversial in part as far as "correct" answers are concerned, are valuable, certainly more valuable than any individual teacher's tests or department's tests can be, to give an objective idea of a pupil's sensitivity to literature and his ability to interpret it. These tests have standardized scores which can be the basis for placing pupils in ability groups, for teacher judgment is not involved, and pupils are compared with one another within an entire grade level.

Other aspects of an English program should also be considered in evaluating an overall program. What can we do to evaluate such innovations in English teaching, as team teaching, programed learning, a reduced load, or the use of contract readers? Unless a school has a research department and qualified personnel to engage in evaluation procedures, a department chairman can not do much that will stand up under scientific scrutiny. At the same time, however, I don't believe that innovation should be made and continue without some form of evaluation. All of us know that very little we have ever done in English has been evaluated in any but subjective ways.

If a school is fortunate enough to provide reduced loads for teachers of English and the use of contract readers, then the administration and the board of education should expect instruction to improve and pupils to write more and improve in their ability to write. Such innovations are expensive, and unless high pupil productivity results, such expenditures are hardly justifiable. A department chairman must be prepared to give such proof if he is to protect his teachers from criticism by members of other departments, who also can see advantages for them of a reduced load.

Many of the advantages of team teaching are impossible to evaluate objectively. Departments that have experimented with it know that if team teaching is established properly to give individual teachers an opportunity to teach their special interest or to use their special abilities, pupils not only enjoy English more but benefit more. Subjective comments of pupils and teachers which attest to this fact provide some evidence that team teaching is worthwhile. Team teaching can also give teachers more time to prepare certain areas of instruction than if they were responsible for every area.

Programed learning is still very new and needs to be evaluated objectively if schools are going to make very much use of it. So far, however, programed materials in English have not been very good, a fact which probably explains why few schools have used them or continued to use them once they were introduced. Often, too, the materials have been misused, just as often textbooks or workbooks have been, and then the materials themselves rather than the methods employed in their use have become the scapegoat. It seems to me that if teachers are intelligent in the way they use all materials that programed materials can become valuable aids, just as have filmstrips, films, and recordings.

Certainly questionnaires sent to a school's graduates can be helpful in evaluating a school's program in English, particularly if the questionnaires were sent a year or two after graduation to a fairly representative random sampling including pupils of varying abilities. Specific questions involving a school's *composition* program can be helpful to a department, such questions, for example, as, "What methods used in teaching you to write do you recall having been most helpful?" or "What writing experiences have proved most helpful to you?"

Questions evolved from a department's literature program can also prove enlightening and valuable, particularly if they evoke graduates' comments on enjoyment of reading in school and whether as an adult they are continuing to read. It is also interesting to list specific titles that were in the curriculum and ask pupils to recall whether they liked or disliked them and why. Pupil judgment in the matter of literature is particularly important if enjoyment of reading is one of our goals.

An excellent method of evaluation of a department's program is to involve an entire department in a questionnaire based on such criteria as those established by the Commission on the Curriculum of the National Council of Teachers of English in "A Check List for Evaluating the English Program in the Junior and Senior High School."[9] Once this questionnaire has been given, department meetings can be used to discuss its results, and recommendations involving an entire staff can be made. If a department is a large one, more profitable discussions might be held on a grade level basis with recommendations then made to an entire staff. When an entire department is involved in procedures of evaluation and recommendation, it is more likely a department's curriculum and teaching of it will be affected.

---

[9] Dwight L. Burton *et al.*, "A Check List for Evaluating the English Program in the Junior and Senior High School," *English Journal*, LI (April 1962).

Outside specialists can be valuable, too, in evaluation procedures, especially in schools in which perhaps the staff is tradition-bound or not particularly professional in its interest in keeping up with the newer trends or results of research in the teaching of English. Often, experts from the outside can be the catalyst to bring about curriculum changes that a department chairman or staff cannot do.

The role of the chairman in evaluating the overall program of an English department and in maintaining sequence of instruction is an important one because only he has the responsibility to view the entire program of a department. Teachers within the department, by the very nature of their assignments, usually become too concerned with their individual roles to see the proverbial forest. Though it is the department chairman's job to help his teachers look at a department's entire program, the administration will after all hold him responsible for it. Therefore, evaluation and maintenance of sequence must be most important to him.

RESPONSIBILITIES IN SELECTING, TRAINING, AND SUPERVISING THE ENGLISH STAFF

1. "The English Department Chairman's Role in Recruiting and Selecting Teachers"
   TRAVIS E. HARRIS, *English Department Chairman,*
   Manhasset High School, Manhasset, L. I., New York

2. "Helping Beginning Teachers and Inadequately Prepared Teachers"
   MARGARET CASEY, *English Department Chairman,*
   Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, Bethesda, Maryland

3. "The Chairman's Role in Inservice Education"
   WILLIAM M. SEE, *English Department Chairman,*
   Jefferson High School, Portland, Oregon

4. "The Supervision of English Teaching"
   MABEL M. BROWN, *English Department Chairman,*
   Reno High School, Reno, Nevada

The English Department Chairman's Role in Recruiting and Selecting Teachers

Travis E. Harris
English Department Chairman
Manhasset High School
Manhasset, L. I., New York

Americans are a mobile people. For the past ten years competition among school districts has made the finding and holding of good teachers increasingly difficult. Though there may seem to be no connection between these two ideas, yet both have a direct bearing in the chairman's role in recruiting and selecting teachers. In the first place, when the candidate is a young married woman it is absolutely necessary to determine that her husband will be stationed in one place for at least a three-year period. Otherwise she is likely to leave the system even before she has reached tenure status. Secondly, it is probably unwise to hire any teacher solely on the basis of his acceptance of a position because the salary offered is higher than that of neighboring districts. Salaries are in such a state of flux that if salary has been the only attraction to a particular school district, teachers may move after one year.

Obviously then, the department chairman must be reasonably certain that of the candidates available, he considers only those who will probably offer some stability to the department. No matter how excellent a teacher may be, there is little point in favoring him if it is almost certain that he will move after a year or two. One way of assuring less turnover of personnel is to offer more than salary. To do this, the chairman must have the assistance and backing of his administration, especially the principal and superintendent, as well as other key members of the department.

If a suburban high school is to acquire well qualified teachers, the administration must offer candidates the following as a minimum: (1) four classes of no more than thirty students (preferably 20-25); (2) no extra duties aside from two study halls weekly *or* a home room; (3) paid readers of student themes; (4) extra pay for extra work (year books, student newspapers, and literary magazines should offer extra compensation and should not necessarily be supervised by English teachers); (5) no required committee work unless it is directly related to curriculum revision or development in the immediate department. Superintendents and principals are beginning to learn from experience that the days of the workhorse teacher are over.

If all of the conditions outlined above do not already exist in his department, the chairman has an obligation to work with his administration and board of education to make them understand the problem. If, after a period of several years, the struggle seems hopeless, he himself should consider moving on to a more dynamic school district. Once there is a basis of mutual respect between chairman and administration, then the chairman can assume his proper role. The chairman will, of course, have access to the completed forms of all candidates for English positions on file in the superintendent's office. Unless a chairman has this kind of cooperation from the superintendent and principal, his position is meaningless and untenable.

When a vacancy occurs, then the work begins. If members of the department have friends who might consider moving, these potential candidates should be encouraged to add their applications to those already on file. This may often be a good source of new teachers especially if these potential candidates have teaching experience. Then on the basis of the number of hours actually acquired in English subject matter, and on the grades on the college transcripts, at least three candidates should be considered for any one opening. These people may be notified immediately that they are under consideration and either be given suggested times for appointments or better still, be asked to write letters requesting appointments.

The chairman should consider only those among the available candidates who offer the soundest preparation in English from a high caliber college or university. A chairman should not hesitate to take a person with little or no experience in teaching if the candidate offers more subject matter courses in English than he does education credits. He will have to meet the state requirement, but he can often complete such courses in evening hours or summer sessions, if necessary, while he is getting the practical experience in the classroom.

After the chairman has narrowed his choice down to three, and after the principal and superintendent have studied the application blanks and transcripts, it is time for the interview. Incidentally, in the preliminary stages, it is certainly a good idea to have several experienced members of the department review candidates' credentials. It is also probably wise to eliminate any candidate whose transcript shows grades of C or below in more than one English course.

Interviews should now be arranged between the chairman and candidate, the candidate and principal, and then possibly among all three at one time. At any rate, at some point in the procedure the chairman should introduce the candidate to all other members of the department, get their individual reactions, and take these into consideration. If there is a serious objection to a candidate by an individual department member, the whole department should meet to discuss the candidate. If a majority agreement is reached and the administration approves of the candidate, then an effort should be made to visit the candidate in a teaching situation in his own school. This may require delicate handling, but probably the direct approach is best.

The principal should be the one to call the principal of the candidate's school simply stating that Mr. X. has applied for a position in Y high school, and that he would like, if possible, to come with his English chairman to visit a class. Certainly no principal can reasonably object to this direct approach if it is made early enough in the spring. He will then have a fair opportunity to talk over the situation with his teacher who is contemplating a move. He may find out why the move is contemplated and then make any adjustments in his power if he wishes to retain the teacher. This procedure may well force the hand of the original employer and prevent his making a delayed offer to hold a teacher after it appears that the candidate actually intends to move. Complete frankness on both sides at this stage of the negotiations is apt to prevent a candidate's vacillation, since he will have all the facts on which to base a decision.

After principal and chairman witness the candidate in action in a teaching situation, they should, of course, confer on what they have observed. Allowing for understandable nervousness on the part of the teacher under observation, the visitors should be able to make a reasonably accurate evaluation of the candidate's potential. This is a point at which the chairman's judgment and recommendation should be strongly considered. If the chairman believes the candidate to be fully qualified, or even if he sees minor flaws which may be readily corrected, he should recommend hiring the candidate. If, on the other hand, the principal has strong objections to the personality of the candidate and honestly believes that he will not fit in the total faculty picture, then the chairman should listen to reason no matter how strong an English teacher he may lose. If the principal and chairman have a good relationship, such judgments can amicably be worked out.

Obviously most of these suggestions have their limitations in a market where good teachers are at a premium or in a school system where there is not a constant flow of applications. But there is another source of teaching talent through the training institution and the student teacher. The chairman has the responsibility to persuade his department to take a student teacher as frequently as possible. If a school system can align itself with a good teacher training institution and, in turn, build up a reputation for training a student well, it is really establishing a built-in source of good future teachers. What is more logical than to hire a good student teacher who has proven himself in the very department where he accepts his first teaching position? These ideal situations do not always work out, but they do at least offer another source of teaching talent too often not even considered.

The recruiting process described above assumes a supply of worthy candidates. If such is the case, the selection process is a relatively easy matter. The points to be considered in the order of relative importance are:

1. Character and personality. The person chosen should be altruistic, sincerely interested in learning and in conveying this interest to others;

2. Teaching ability and knowledge of subject matter. These must be inseparable from point one. Without both qualifications a young candidate should be discouraged from teaching as a career;
3. Willingness to adjust to (not necessarily to accept) the limitations of secondary school teaching and the mores of the particular community in which he would be a new member;
4. Sincere interest in new ideas and fearlessness in presenting them to his colleagues as well as to the frequently found conservative elements on the school board and in the community. This includes a constant desire to improve teaching methods and to strive for better adult-adolescent relationships.

In selecting a teacher, the chairman should be certain that the candidate really qualifies under point three so that he can get on with his major concern avoiding unnecessary friction and uproar. However, a candidate should probably be rejected unless he also qualifies under point four. A completely passive attitude of acceptance of the status quo should disqualify anyone from the professions, particularly from the teaching profession.

If any of the attractive working conditions outlined in this paper are not present in a school system, the chairman should work, with the department's backing, to see that the situation is changed. He may have to confront the board of education and the superintendent to encourage a more enlightened viewpoint. He may well stimulate a reeducation of community attitudes toward education.

The key problem, in teaching recruitment, however, is the one which opened this discussion, the differentials in salary from district to district, and the fact that most salaries are still too low. It is possible for a young person immediately out of college with one degree to start at a salary in the business world which it took his father or mother twenty years to earn in teaching. Worse than this is the fact that although starting salaries are much higher than they used to be in teaching, increases in salary are neither as high nor as rapid as they are in other professions. Since young people are willing to move from place to place, it often happens that discouraging conditions and inadequate salary cause excellent teachers not only to move from school to school, but sometimes into a related or entirely different position which promises more rapid advancement and shorter hours.

As long as a shortage of qualified teachers persists, the constant raiding of one school district by another with the lure of a few more dollars seems inevitable. Whatever role the chairman hopes to play in the recruiting and selection of teachers, especially in a small school system, he is severely handicapped by conditions beyond his control. Within the given framework, he must continue to work intelligently to create the best possible conditions in his own school, until the day when the general public becomes fully aware that many basic problems remain to be solved. When and if successful efforts are made to find solutions at the state and national levels, then the department chairman's role can be effectively filled in the school community.

Helping Beginning Teachers and Inadequately Prepared Teachers

Margaret Casey
English Department Chairman
Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School
Bethesda, Maryland

Gone are the days in most school systems when teachers return to the classroom on the same day as students. Teachers of experience realize that they are not ready to begin the year's work with little or no preparation in their subject matter. But there is little opportunity to do something about this for the beginning teacher.

Though the beginning teacher may have had an English methods course and a few weeks of practice teaching in his college classes, he has been accustomed to the lecture method which is not suitable for high school; he has little, if any, firsthand experience with the inductive approach; and he has probably had no chance to read the course of study and the textbooks that will be used.

A first step that must be taken to improve the teaching of English is to admit that a college major in English cannot possibly demonstrate the background and understanding essential to the meaningful teaching of the language arts. If one could absorb the content in four years, he would still need to acquire the techniques of teaching. Anyone who teaches English or supervises teachers of English must realize that even the best prepared beginning teachers will need a considerable amount of help if they are not going to learn almost entirely at the expense of students.

It would seem essential, then, that a period of time before the opening of school, perhaps three to five days, be devoted to the orientation of English teachers.

Since all good teaching demands purpose and selectivity, beginning teachers should become familiar with the educational philosophy of the school. If they can realize that they are all working toward common goals based on common beliefs, the realization will give them a sense of belonging which for beginning teachers is important. To this end they should become acquainted with the philosophy of the English department and conscientiously strive to teach within the framework of the philosophy of the department. Then they will be effective teachers, for implicit in the philosophy are the content and the method. Teachers should ask themselves frequently during the year whether they are teaching in accordance with departmental philosophy.

Particularly helpful for the beginning teacher are suggestions concerning routines of the English classroom. A chairman could prepare a list of routines which experienced teachers have found to be most suitable in terms of learning, and purposeful ways of expending energy and time.

Too frequently beginning teachers are left to find out for themselves the services that a school offers. The orientation period would be the best time for a chairman to have service personnel speak to teachers. The data which they provide would give teachers a familiarity with the school as a whole. Counselors, who are often employed for an eleven month period, could be asked to provide class rolls with relevant data.

Acquainting teachers with the facilities of the school library should precede making lesson plans. If the school system is large, the supervisor of library services could be asked to talk about the main curriculum library. If time permits, it would be advisable for teachers to visit the curriculum library and learn firsthand how willing librarians are to work with classroom teachers.

Whether or not a system has a supervisor of library services, it will have a school librarian who should explain how the library can be of service to teachers and students. The beginning teacher should look upon the librarian as a co-worker who is willing to do much of the groundwork for source reading as well as give book talks, supply reading lists, prepare displays to supplement class activities, and stock the professional shelves with helpful books, magazines, and pamphlets.

During the orientation period, the chairman might have whoever is in charge of the school's instructional materials and equipment explain and demonstrate their use and arrange for teachers to learn how to operate them. Before classes begin, teachers should know not only what kinds of equipment but also what filmstrips, slides, films, and recordings the school or system owns, where they are stored, and how they may be secured.

Teachers acquainted with the philosophy of the school and the services the school offers are ready to be introduced to the language and literature programs. A chairman should provide time and guidance for the reading of the courses of study and should encourage questions.

Part of the preschool period might be spent in a workshop situation where teachers could prepare a tentative outline of the year's work and work out a first unit. The chairman's responsibility should be to have necessary materials on hand, to acquaint teachers with material available for groups of varying ability, and to suggest possible units. Beginning teachers should be urged to prepare imaginative lessons for the first few days so that students will not feel that they are having the "same old thing" again.

No matter how excellent the orientation period may be, new teachers will continue to need help or guidance. This can be offered by an experienced teacher who works with a new teacher somewhat in the capacity of the collegiate "big brother" or "big sister." Wherever possible, it is advisable to pair teachers from adjacent rooms so that it is easy to ask questions and learn something from the bulletin boards and chalkboards of the experienced teacher. Not to be underestimated is what the experienced teacher can learn from the beginner, who generally brings to the classroom new methods and youthful vitality. If the paired teachers instruct the same grade level, there will be a natural situation for discussion of content and methods, for exchanging materials and teaching devices.

The informal relationship between the paired teachers may be a mutually satisfactory experience, but the new teacher will look to the chairman as the one person who has a special obligation to help him. The chairman should show appreciation for the enthusiasm and new methods that the beginning teacher brings to the classroom. He should also show confidence in him by commending him for his successes, by pointing out his strengths, by listening sympathetically to his problems, and by helping him to realize his potential. This belief in the teacher will help to minimize the mistakes and the errors in judgment that are commonly made in the initial years of teaching. Early in the semester, a chairman should try to discover the interests and talents of new teachers and give them opportunities for enriching the school program.

The relationship between the department chairman and the new teacher will, to a large extent, be determined by the administrative setup of the school. The best relationship is probably established when the chairman acts as a resource person rather than supervisor, for a teacher responds more warmly to one whose sole function is to help. If, however, it is the duty of the chairman to observe and evaluate, there should be in the department one or more master teachers with released time to serve as resource teachers, possibly on a rotating basis.

Whether a chairman is a supervisor or resource person, he can make available various kinds of teaching aids; for example, he can have extensive files of lessons worked out by members of the department on the teaching of particular units, novels, short stories, essays, and poems; suggestions as to the kinds of questions that can be asked on a particular type of literature; grammar lessons demonstrating the inductive approach; a composition check list; samples of carefully corrected compositions from required assignments; samples of semester examinations. Another valuable aid for beginning teachers is a card file of significant articles on method and content from publications such as the *English Journal, College English, Reports and Speeches of the Yale Conference.*

The aids that a chairman prepares for beginning teachers should help to solve some of their common problems. Most new teachers, enthusiastic about subject matter, try to give students by means of the lecture method what they recently learned in college or in graduate school. Though a few bright students may be challenged by this introduction to a new and exciting world, most students will feel lost. New teachers must learn how to ask questions and to direct discussion; they must learn to involve students in the learning process. Though the kinds of aids suggested will help make the classroom more student-centered than teacher-centered, beginners need to observe teachers who have acquired the art of questioning and of stimulating discussion on a level that is meaningful to students.

Perhaps the most effective way to show new teachers how to involve students in the learning process is an inservice course in which the chairman uses methods with teachers that demand their involvement.

Another serious problem among beginning teachers is their inability to integrate instruction. Grammar, mechanics, spelling, composition, and literature are taught separately, preventing the students from seeing relationships. They learn to identify, for example, verbals; but they do not see how a series of infinitives can make their own writing more emphatic or how a participial phrase can subordinate an idea. Since too often teachers themselves sometimes do not see the relevance of what they are teaching, a chairman might suggest that beginning teachers jot down concrete reasons for teaching whatever it is they plan to teach. A suggestion made earlier may be repeated here: teachers should make an effort to know the course of study so thoroughly that they do not need to refer to it.

Lack of integration leads to the problem of covering too much too fast. As each item is taught, it is checked off as though it had been mastered. When teachers make use of opportunities to relate, to review, to reinforce, and to see any aspect of English as a composite, the checking off process will be eliminated and the spiral process will take its place. A chairman should try to impress upon beginning teachers the necessity of reinforcing in a multitude of ways whatever has been presented. If the matter is not worth reviewing and reinforcing, it is not worth teaching in the first place.

A less serious problem of the beginning teacher, but nonetheless real, is that of allotting time. Though experience generally teaches one to handle this problem, beginners can be taught to estimate. If at the beginning of the year they make a tentative outline that provides for required teachings, then they can make necessary adjustments as the year proceeds. To help teachers prepare outlines, a chairman should have available copies of yearly plans that experienced teachers have used and also copies of daily plan books which show direction. Even after a teacher has successfully outlined his work, he may have difficulty in getting started; for example, a beginning teacher might ask, "What is an effective way of introducing *Julius Caesar*?" He should be urged to discuss such matters with experienced teachers and, if necessary, consult the chairman who could work out with him some possible approaches, give him suitable reading materials, and suggest audiovisual aids.

Time will take care of many of the problems of beginning teachers, but time alone does not ensure that teachers will provide direction to assist students in writing better. In discussing the correction of compositions, a chairman should admit that reading compositions is a difficult, and often a challenging, task, for it involves thinking about integrity and tone as well as mechanics and rhetorical devices. Some papers must be read many times before the reader can state precisely how the writer went astray; until the reader knows exactly what the difficulty is he should not comment. Any suggestion or comment should show a student what is good about his writing, what needs to be revised, and how to revise. New teachers must be taught to make comments and suggestions that are specific enough for students to act upon them. The best way of teaching teachers how to read papers meaningfully is to provide them with a number of carefully corrected compositions. An English department would do well for all teachers to have available a bulletin on Analysis of Student Writing and to schedule a number of meetings for teachers to evaluate papers together.

Though the greater part of a chairman's work with beginning teachers will be carried on in conferences and group meetings, an occasional visit to the classroom, preferably by invitation, enables a chairman to make more pertinent and more specific suggestions and commendations. If he is invited to observe, he should make every effort to do so to show his interest in the teacher and in his class. Or when the chairman has helped a teacher prepare a lesson he could express interest in seeing how the work is progressing. What should come out of any visit is the feeling on the part of the teacher that the chairman respects him as a person and is interested in his becoming a first-rate teacher.

Visits by the chairman will be valuable only if they are followed by a conference in which the new teacher learns what in the lesson was good and what needed improvement. If the class itself is a difficult one, the chairman should represent himself as sympathetic and appreciative of the teacher's efforts in a trying situation. During the conference that follows a class visit, the teacher should be made to feel free to comment, to explain why he used a certain approach, and to ask questions; and he has a right to expect the chairman to make specific suggestions for improvement and point out what in the lesson was good.

Unless a chairman is employed to supervise, he would be wise not to visit classrooms except on rare occasions. If he feels that a teacher needs more help than his position makes it possible to give, he should report the problem to the principal or supervisor. In discussing a teacher with a principal or supervisor, a chairman should make every effort to distinguish between the situations that demand attention and those that can be overlooked. Through experimentation and through occasional failure the intelligent teacher will learn to cope with classroom problems and to adapt methods and content.

What has previously been said about beginning teachers is equally applicable to inadequately prepared teachers. But whereas most beginning teachers expect to be supervised and expect to ask for and to be given help the inadequately prepared teachers are more sensitive to correction and at times less amenable to suggestion. In helping the beginning teacher, a chairman can be direct; in helping the inadequately prepared he must be subtle, working through groups rather than with the individual. Most often the inadequately prepared teacher is not aware of his limitations. He is likely to be quite sincere in presenting grammar and usage unrelated to composition, vocabulary unrelated to context, and literature unrelated to life. For the most part the inadequately prepared teacher does not have the initiative to subscribe to and read professional magazines, attend conferences, or even discuss the curriculum and methods with other members of the staff. He is likely to be much less enthusiastic and inquisitive than the beginning teacher.

The inadequate teacher needs first to be made aware of what is going on in the professional world. Personal involvement is essential. It is possible for a chairman to suggest that a school pay partial expenses of a teacher to a convention or to release him from classes to attend lectures or workshops. It is also possible for a chairman to recommend to a supervisor that certain teachers be invited to participate in paid summer workshops, for though better prepared teachers would make greater contributions and make the workshop operation easier for the leader, it is only through working with more capable and more professionally alive people that the inadequately prepared will improve themselves.

Shared teaching is another means of improving the quality of teaching provided no one is required to participate against his will. A chairman might ask all teachers of a particular grade to decide cooperatively what aspects of the work might be effectively taught to large groups, and then ask for volunteers to prepare material or to present it. Small groups could arrive at the problem and the goals and suggest means of approaching the problem. In a situation of this kind each person will make a serious effort to do his best, and the teacher who is too timid to present a lecture might instead volunteer to do research or to work with small groups. Once again learning takes place from personal involvement. Where it is not practical to experiment with large groups, it is possible to have two teachers who have parallel classes plan a unit of work together. From the more experienced teacher, the new or less well prepared teacher can learn how to plan a unit of work, how to make good use of library facilities, how to divide groups according to needs, how to handle discussion, and even how to handle disciplinary problems. It will be the duty of the more experienced teacher to see that his partner has a chance to do whatever he feels he can do well. When teachers share teaching, students should not feel that one is superior and one inferior.

It has been a common practice for years for new and inadequately prepared teachers to visit the classes of successful teachers. Merely visiting classes is not enough; preparation for the visit should be made. When a chairman or supervisor suggests that a particular teacher be visited, he should point out what it is that he wants the visitors to observe. A chairman or supervisor should visit the classroom with teachers so that he can discuss with them the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson and of the teacher. The very best teachers can have things go wrong even in the presence of visitors, but the successful teacher will not disintegrate and will not lose control of the classroom. It is good for the inexperienced teacher to see composure under difficult conditions. Observing a lesson that was not successful may also reveal to the observer his own weaknesses. It is often helpful for the teacher being visited to explain to the new teacher and the chairman what he had attempted and to what extent he thought the lesson was successful or unsuccessful. Unless a conference of some kind can follow a visit, it would be preferable not to recommend observation.

The suggestions made in this paper are very simple ones, for they take into consideration the fact that most chairmen carry heavy teaching loads. For a more comprehensive plan to help beginning and inadequately prepared teachers, we will need to hear from chairmen who have fewer than four classes a day.

The Chairman's Role in Inservice Education

William M. See
English Department Chairman
Jefferson High School
Portland, Oregon

The English chairman's responsibilities in the Portland Public Schools are twofold: he has general districtwide duties as well as specific duties within the building in which he teaches.

In some fields of English instruction, the district curriculum tends to be prescriptive, especially in the areas in which sequence is important. But in addition to the "required," each school adjusts the basic, citywide curriculum to the needs of its students. The unique personality which each of the twelve high schools possesses is evidenced in the variety of groupings and in the way the course content is manipulated to meet the needs of the students in each school. Yet, at the heart of this variety is a unity, strengthend by teacher-constructed English guides distributed to each of the 370 secondary English teachers. These guides often form the point of departure for inservice instruction because they contain a clearly defined scope and sequence, teaching methods, specific questions to ask, and scholarly explications for each unit.

Within each school, the principal does the daily supervision, and one of the vice principals is assigned to curriculum and supervision for all areas. In addition, each school has an English chairman well informed about the overall English program. The English chairman's position is entirely advisory in nature: he does not hire, fire, or evaluate teachers.

Once a month, the English chairmen meet with the English supervisor and the assistant supervisor to discuss district changes and innovations, and to exchange ideas on methods and materials for the improvement of the guides. Often the chairmen serve as a sounding board for suggestions relayed to them by English teachers and administrators. In this way, the chairmen act as intermediaries between teachers and administrators.

Among the chairman's responsibilities within his building is inservice education. Portland's inservice program received an extraordinary boost about five years ago when our school board asked the superintendent to initiate a study to determine what could be done within the secondary schools to improve our curriculum. The initial survey revealed what many English teachers had predicted: English teachers needed to go back to school to catch up on recent developments in our field.

Financially assisted by a grant, we embarked on a five-year curriculum improvement plan. For two consecutive summers, five teachers from each school attended six-week institutes at which graduate level courses in Chaucer, Shakespeare, poetry, composition, syntax, history of English, and speech analysis were taught by outstanding college professors. After each teacher had indicated where he felt his major weaknesses lay, he was enrolled in two courses each summer. In addition to receiving graduate college credit, arranged through a local college, the teacher's tuition was paid, his books were provided, and a stipend was supplied. Both the teachers and the district greatly profited from this experience.

While some teachers were attending the institutes, others, in conjunction with college professors, wrote guides to be used for the implementation of a new English curriculum. Although revisions and additions are still being made, we now have two basic guides in print: one, a four-year sequence in language, composition, and literature for the college oriented students; another for those students of less ability and different interests. Each teacher has a copy of each of the guides, and he is encouraged to choose from both guides those materials which best fit the needs of his students. Interesting to us is the large number of instances in which teachers are discovering that materials originally designed for academically capable students can be modified and used successfully with those who are less able.

After the institutes had been held and materials for the guides had been written and piloted, our major concern became implementation within the schools. The largest number of our teachers felt the need for instruction in modern language study. Therefore, in addition to the regularly offered inservice classes, which are taught by supervisors and teachers and offered each term without tuition, we initiated an inservice class in modern grammar. Since then, the class has been offered several times, and the response has been good. This experience has strengthened our belief that most teachers are aware of their needs for continuing education and will avail themselves of opportunities to improve their backgrounds.

In addition to the citywide inservice classes, some teachers have formed language study groups within their buildings. Many have viewed a district-produced, five-lesson, television series dealing with modern grammar which was broadcast over the local educational television station. Many of our teachers are enrolling in college classes in modern language study.

Although we have been encouraged by the speed with which our new curriculum is being implemented, we continue to plan ways by which we can develop what we think is now a good program into an even better one. We have a well-endowed fund to finance inservice education. The Portland Public Schools have received a grant from the Carnegie Foundation for the purpose of further developing our inservice program in cooperation with the colleges and universities in our state.

The program provides for the development of:

1. Systematic procedures for determining inservice needs at all grade levels and in all subject fields
2. Inservice courses and workshops by teacher committees, assisted by supervisory, administrative, and college personnel; and selection of the best instructors available by these committees (it is assumed that local teachers will be instructors in many instances)
3. Procedures to ensure selection of inservice experiences by teachers, together with principals, that will be most directly helpful in teaching at a particular grade level or in a given subject area
4. Procedures for evaluating and revising the courses and workshops offered under the program
5. Cooperative arrangements with the State System of Higher Education to ensure the greatest possible degree of cooperation in the development and financing of the program and in securing recognition of work taken under the program for graduate university credit
6. Incentives for teachers to participate in the program. Possibilities being considered are:
    a. Salary credit for work done under the program
    b. Tuition-free courses carrying university credit
7. Plans for individual professional improvement programs for those teachers whose specialized teaching assignments make regular inservice courses inappropriate

Courses and workshops will be provided primarily in the summer, and work requirements will be comparable to those of college and university graduate courses. It will take two years and three summers to develop the program to the point where all teachers can participate. During this period, teachers and administrators will be asked to help in aspects of planning and testing the various elements of the program.

Work on this project has already begun. The English supervisors and a steering committee of one language arts teacher from each high school began last spring to meet once a week to identify areas in which English teachers desire additional instruction. They concluded that although teachers want to learn about new methods for teaching, they also want to learn more about their subject matter. Therefore, last summer the supervisors and steering committee members worked together for three weeks, on stipend, to write course outlines geared to correlating instruction in methods and subject matter in areas which are recognized as those which need emphasis. Following is a list of titles from the tentative course outlines developed during last summer's planning session:

1. The Grammar of English
2. The Nature and History of the English Language
3. Advanced Composition for Teachers
4. Teaching the Novel as a Genre
5. Oral Interpretation for Classroom Use

6. Technical Theater for Secondary Schools
7. Speech Analysis
8. Reading and Literature for the Reluctant Reader
9. Orientation for Volunteer Tutors of Socially Disadvantaged Students

The group plans to outline courses in poetry and journalism as well.

These tentative course outlines will be given to the instructors as guides for their presentations. Each outline contains specific organizing objectives, suggested learning activities, and related learnings. Each recommends that the instructor divide his class time between lectures, discussions, and class exercises. Throughout the outlines, the authors stress the importance of combining "theoretical subject matter knowledge with practical classroom methodology."

Implementing a new curriculum calls for considerable inservice training. I believe that inservice education includes all activities and efforts which contribute to the professional improvement of the teacher. It is very difficult to categorize these activities. Some are academic—such as evaluating recently published textbooks. Others are social—such as getting together over a cup of coffee to commiserate when things are not going so well. Generally, inservice activities within my building fall into five broad areas: education of teachers, selection of instructional materials, curriculum development, experimentation, and evaluation. Catagorizing activities within these broad areas is difficult, for suddenly one finds himself involved in "everything at once."

We decided that we would first assess the needs of our students before determining which curriculum materials suggested in the citywide guides should be used in our building. We concluded that we could best meet our needs by grouping students according to their abilities and interests in English. Considerable time was spent establishing the following criteria for grouping.

We decided to make an overall evaluation of each student based on recommendations of previous teachers, counselors' recommendations, standardized test scores, citywide composition test scores, the student's future plans and preferences, and the parents' preferences.

After surveying the general abilities and interests of our students, we established four groupings:

1. One small class on each level for especially capable students—about 5 percent
2. Several classes for average and above average students who are academically capable and interested—about 45 percent
3. Several classes for average and below average students who are not so academically capable or interested—about 45 percent
4. One small class on each level for considerably below average students—about 5 percent

In addition we have several classes for mentally retarded students—taught by specially trained and certified teachers.

To safeguard against placement in a particular group becoming binding, we schedule several sections of the major groupings (numbers 2 and 3 above) each period. In this way we can transfer a student from one group to another without having to disrupt his entire schedule.

As often as possible, each teacher is assigned advanced as well as slow classes. Our especially capable and experienced teachers are placed on all grade levels, and some of our most capable teachers are assigned to ninth grade classes (we reject the premise that the best and most experienced teachers should teach only the college-bound senior classes).

Fortunately, the citywide guides work very well with the grouping structure which we have established. One guide is appropriate for the upper 50 percent, the other for the lower 50 percent.

During the time when we were becoming familiar with materials in the guides, we spent many additional hours in preparation and outside reading. To ease this burden, we assigned each teacher to classes on one grade level, and though this still meant two daily preparations for most teachers, it allowed more time for concentrating on lesson plans appropriate for the two ability groups which each was teaching.

We also asked for more time to plan together which our administrators provided us by cutting a few minutes from each period to establish a planning and conference period for every teacher. After further manipulation of the schedule, all teachers on each grade level were assigned to the same planning and conference period. And for better coordination, a subchairman for each grade level was appointed. The arrangement has worked well, because it has enabled us to share ideas, to evaluate, and even to acquaint new teachers with members of the department.

The major innovation in our curriculum was in the area of language study: syntax, lexicography, dialect, and history of English. Some of us were not certain that we could present these topics successfully, but presenting modern grammar especially concerned us. We decided to present the grammar of English as a humanistic study of importance in itself rather than as a panacea for eliminating writing errors; the results have been good. Although our grammar lessons are linguistically based, we include those features of traditional, structural, and transformational grammars which we feel best enable our students to understand how our language works. Lessons in lexicography have been particularly successful on all levels. Since appropriate materials in this field are scarce, we have relied on the outlines in our guides and have established sets of various kinds of dictionaries, old and new, as our texts. Especially appreciated is the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

Most of us start the year with one of the language study units. This enables us to establish a modern attitude about language right away. And concepts studied in the language units can often be reinforced by relating them to later lessons in composition and literature.

In introducing language study units, sequence is important. For example, it is much easier to present the lexicography unit if students have first completed a study of the syntax of modern grammar. The teacher who does not choose to "convert" creates a problem. But problems during an implementation period must be expected, and an effective way to handle the nonjoiner is to do nothing about him. During a transitional time, one must allow a reasonable period for adjustment. Exposing a nonjoiner to a core of teachers speaking enthusiastically about the successes they have achieved with new materials is infectious.

Another inservice problem arose when we discovered that several of the units in our new curriculum for the slow learner emphasized teaching basic reading skills. Many of us felt that we were not prepared to teach "reading" to secondary students. When the district sponsored a four-week summer institute on teaching the slow learner, with major emphasis on instruction in teaching reading, several teachers from our building attended.

Because our school has a large number of socially disadvantaged students who are considerably below grade level in reading ability, a full-time reading collaborator was assigned to our school to help us initiate a special reading program. Her contribution to our inservice program has been a significant one. Her most significant contribution to our program has been that she has convinced us that most high school English teachers, because of their training, can successfully teach basic reading skills, provided they select appropriate materials and present them on a level within the understanding of their students.

Some of our monthly department meetings within our school have been devoted to such inservice training activities as the following:

1. Discussing and evaluating our four-year scope and sequence
2. Interpreting test data to identify areas in curriculum which need revision
3. Devising methods for rotating the many room sets of books used with the literature and language units
4. Deciding how our department budget allotment can best be spent
5. Establishing a department file of transparencies, photographs, and other supplementary materials
6. Demonstrating audiovisual equipment—especially the overhead projector;
7. Determining preliminary plans that should be completed before library assignments are made
8. Discussing significant professional publications such as *The Students' Right to Read*
9. Discussing our citywide "Guide for the Correction of Compositions"
10. Establishing a schoolwide grading policy
11. Marking a set of composition papers
12. Discussing the advantages and disadvantages of inductive teaching

We continue to experiment. For example, last year we became concerned about the large number of our students who use substandard English, especially in oral discourse. We decided to do some informal research to see if we could eliminate some of the substandard usages. For several months we kept a tally of the most commonly heard errors. This summer, as part of a citywide workshop for teachers of slow learners, three members of our department made tapes for oral practice utilizing our findings of last year. We hope to establish some minimum expression standards this year by asking teachers in all departments to join us in working on standard patterns for oral and written expression.

An English chairman can do considerable inservice training by setting an example for other members of his department. He should be a professionally minded career teacher who is active in local, regional, and national NCTE activities. He should personally invite teachers in his department to join these organizations. He should be willing to participate in and teach inservice classes within his school and within his district. He should be as interested in curriculum development for the slow learner as he is in development of materials for the academically gifted. He should support the student teacher or intern programs and willingly accept the responsibility of supervising cadet teachers. And he should encourage students who are outstanding in English to consider teaching English as a career.

The Supervision of English Teaching

Mabel M. Brown
English Department Chairman
Reno High School
Reno, Nevada

"I think," said Archibald MacLeish at the NCTE convention in Philadelphia, "English always stands with a foot in the text and a foot in the world, and what it undertakes to teach is neither the one nor the other but the relation between them." Presumably, the instrument of revelation is the English teacher, standing, like his subject, with one foot rooted in his material and the other in the classroom. The position is not entirely comfortable.

Most English teachers feel a scholarly commitment to their subject matter. But their faith is menaced by the harsh realities of the secondary school. The beginning teacher who has discovered the attractions of the pursuit of knowledge has not always discovered how to face groups of youngsters uninterested in learning to read and write. Invariably conversations of teachers express a mass frustration—engendered by the paper load, by administrative routines, or by student ignorance and apathy.

Some teachers take refuge in pragmatic mediocrity; others, assuming no compelling responsibility to do the job well, do not really teach at all. A teacher confronted with five classes of thirty students declines to make writing assignments on the ground that his time is too valuable to be spent reading trivia. Another refuses to follow the syllabus or the texts and spends weeks explicating the imagistic structure of a poem to sophomores who can barely read. Another, finding solace in the traditional winds that blew through his own training, spends unconscionable periods in good old-fashioned diagraming, writing sentences in improbable disarray on the blackboard. Another, ignorant of his own subject matter, dabbles in that of another department or regales students with bits and pieces of his own "interesting experiences." Still another exemplifies the oppressive paradox of the individual who has chosen teaching as a career but who holds students in contempt, annihilating them with sarcasm in order to expose his own superior standards.

It is the function of supervision to help the teacher keep well informed and to help him meet the practical problems of day-to-day instruction without losing his devotion to his subject matter and without retreating into irrelevant busywork. The central goal of supervision is improved instruction.

INDIRECT SUPERVISION

A supervisor cannot hope to improve instruction without departmental consensus on the nature of a good course. A department chairman imposes an exacting task upon the teacher when he asks him to conform to his general view toward the subject matter. A primary responsibility of the chairman-supervisor is leadership in the establishment of a workable curriculum.

Establishing a workable curriculum. The chairman-supervisor can exercise the profitable kind of indirect supervision by identifying major new currents that affect the teaching of English and relating them to the overall policy of the department.

The predilections of department members do not always coincide; thus writing a course of study is essential to map the territory for which each teacher is responsible. The course of study has two main purposes: (1) to provide both a general and detailed view of the course for a new teacher, and (2) to set the lines of policy which department members have agreed to follow. Ideally a course of study will embody a clear and extended statement of principles; coordinated and sequential materials for programs in language, composition, and literature; regulations concerning theme requirements, the grading of papers, examinations, and the like; and provisions for individual differences among students. When a syllabus or course of study prescribes a good course, the teacher's own sense of standards is likely to stimulate his inventiveness in the classroom and to help him make sensible use of the text. The department chairman indirectly supervises new teachers or poorly prepared teachers as he elaborates the rationale of the work, anticipates major teaching problems, furnishes considerable description of good practices, and amplifies sample lessons—preferably by demonstration.

Utilizing staff in supervision. The best philosophy and course of study must be implemented by good instruction. Having recognized the potentialities of individual staff members, a chairman can utilize his cadre of experienced teachers to instruct others. In some schools every new teacher is assigned an advisor who, by observing several class meetings, diagnoses typical classroom problems and demonstrates individual solutions. Simultaneously, the new instructor is invited to visit his advisor's classes, or classes taught by experienced staff members. This procedure encourages teachers to talk to one another about what they are doing, and to encourage experimentation. Since the tone of such a visiting system is one of friendly and interested collaboration and since its purpose is not to rate but to help a colleague, the novice welcomes and accepts suggestions. The best evidence that such a system works is that department members who have been reared in it wish to have it continued.

Exchange of classroom visits should be accompanied by other exchange. When the chairman observes superior teaching techniques or successful assignments, he can encourage the gifted teacher to pass the substance of his work on to the department. He may ask him to give a demonstration at a department meeting or simply ask that he describe his procedures. Recognizing good work may boost staff morale by giving due recognition to the outstanding teacher while proposing imitative experimentation. Department members may profitably exchange sets of themes. Thus without increasing his paper load, a teacher can check his own criteria for evaluating student writing by attention to the corrections and comments of a colleague whose standards he respects.

DIRECT SUPERVISION

Such cooperative activities and interchanges are of major importance, but the development of good teaching in a staff is likely to require also more direct supervision, which has three aims: to guide the inexperienced teacher, to ensure certain measures of uniformity in the course, and to evaluate teachers. If supervision and rating are the responsibility of the department chairman, he may wish to gather information and chart his course through some of the following methods: (1) visiting classes and directing ensuing conferences, (2) surveying lesson plans, (3) surveying test results, (4) directing the composition program, (5) utilizing department meetings and supervisory bulletins.

Visiting classes and directing conferences. Although it sounds spurious to say so, the supervisor must be a master critic, quick to perceive the strengths and weaknesses of a lesson, and a master diplomat, ready to suggest without raising hackles, without sharp words. Somehow he must convince his colleague that his purpose is not to criticize or impose a pattern of teaching on him but to help him improve the teaching of English; he must make that colleague aware of his responsibility.

The facts of poor teaching are mostly observable, and mostly susceptible to supervision. The truths which the facts add up to, though, are neither obvious nor very susceptible. Translating ideas into classroom procedures and articulating curricula are not simple. Too frequently we regard a teacher's attainment with too much presumption and arrogance; teaching everything at once is presumption, and assuming that we can do it is arrogance. A skilled supervisor will discern what is happening in the classroom and break up complex matters into smaller, learnable sequences. He will not attack everything he sees, and even though he is frustrated, he will not expect rapid change.

Supervisors tend to place more value on the class visitation than do teachers and feel that they give more help than teachers believe they receive. Unfortunately, many teachers worry about classroom visitation. To accomplish full value from the classroom visit, personal conference of the supervisor and the teacher should follow, preferably on the same day. The supervisor should report to a teacher as quickly as possible. The conference enables the chairman to carry out many of his supervisory responsibilities. Should the chairman have questions or criticism, he allows the teacher to elaborate or explain, and he suggests ways of improving the effectiveness of the class.

To reach his colleagues, the supervisor, rather than offer attitudes, must offer concrete and specific suggestions. Before a conference the supervisor may well ask: (1) What profitable information can I offer about subject matter, planning and instruction, classroom organization, school policy, special services, about adjusting classroom instruction to individual differences? (2) What materials can I supply to supplement my words? A teacher is more likely to accept techniques if he can be shown specifically how to use them, particularly if he can be given materials to implement them. An arsenal of reference materials is an essential adjunct to the supervisor's directions. Special articles of the *English Journal, College English, CCC,* and state bulletins, gathered into portfolios devoted to specific topics, are useful in helping a teacher to close some gaps in his training and scholarship. The days of one language book and one anthology are gone, so the supervisor must make available many different texts—remedial texts, enriched texts, supplementary texts—and such instructional aids as films, recordings, filmstrips, and tapes.

Surveying lesson plans. A supervisor may be called "unreasonable" for requiring certain minima of instruction. He should, nevertheless, insist that a teacher make his room attractive, that he stand as much as possible when he is teaching, that he maintain order and discipline, and that he be prepared daily—in writing. Lesson plans may prevent wasted class hours if a substitute must come in. When a teacher is asked to bring his plans book to the teacher-supervisor conference for suggestions from the supervisor regarding plans for subsequent lessons, the teacher readily accepts help. It is often futile to criticize past procedures; planning ahead is more fruitful.

Surveying test results. Statistical evaluations based on standardized or uniform department tests are open to misinterpretation and abuse. Such evaluations may have a limited significance for supervision where total enrollment is so large that test results indicate valid patterns. Over a long period of time one may be able to observe whether one teacher's students score consistently lower than another's, but he must carefully consider the reliability, validity, and administrability of the examination. A teacher whose sections consistently perform badly might be singled out for more precise help. Obviously such a determinant must be used with discrimination and should only supplement judgments gathered from other supervisory techniques. Uniform examinations are more useful for testing common standards and for ensuring uniform practices. Certain provisions for individualization are still possible within the framework of the departmentwide examination.

Directing the composition program. Many specific problems influence the quality of instruction, but frequently the most important ones relate to the composition program. Too many teachers are unprepared to teach composition; too many are uninformed about what is important; and too many are incapable of evaluating students' writing. Criticism of the teaching of composition is clear to anyone who wishes to obtain opinions. Many teachers are aware of the mediocrity and slipshod inadequacy of student writing; but often, as a consequence of lack of supervision and leadership within a department and a school, little writing or writing that is repetitious and disorganized is done in high school English courses.

It is both difficult and unwise to prescribe a composition program and to insist that one formula will bring about the best student performance. But it is even more unwise to retreat from action because opinion and practice vary widely or because we do not agree with some assumptions served up as dicta. Despite the danger of arbitrariness, the English department at Reno High School has worked to plan systematic improvement in the teaching of composition and to see that plans are carried out. I record some of their procedures not because they are exemplary but because having uniform procedures has helped keep before us (1) objectives for all students to achieve gradually at different rates and to varying degrees, (2) standards of competency which we justly expect, and (3) fixed criteria by which to judge accomplishment.

Though regulations may seem arbitrary, they are loyally adhered to by all department members, who, after all, were intimately engaged in making them. Our first step tried to inspire commitment to writing. We attempted to dignify written composition by making students aware of its importance for self expression and for success in college or in any vocation and by making every writing assignment a carefully disciplined performance. We ruled that a student's failure to write the required number of themes meant failure in the course and that a student whose theme file was incomplete would not be admitted to the final examination. Departmental "positions" fall into four categories. The first outlines the required abilities in English which we regard as necessary. The second sets forth grading standards in composition which all members agreed upon, three levels (superior, average, and unacceptable) and six criteria (content, organization, sentence structure, diction, spelling, and mechanics). In department meetings we attempted to illustrate these standards by themes reproduced in typescript and by extended critical comment. The third part lists those teaching practices which in our judgment best develop the student's reading and other experience; requiring primarily expository writing, to be analyzed by the teacher for thought and organization as well as mechanics and to be carefully revised by the student. The fourth sets realistic minimum writing assignments per class per grading period. Teachers submit sets of graded themes to the chairman-supervisor at the end of each grading period.

The achievement of standards cannot be left to a few conscientious individuals. To some teachers, however, the minimum requirements seem to represent ideals; if so, they are ideals which can be achieved under favorable circumstances; and even if the ideal is only partially achieved, the student will have gained insight into writing. By surveying graded papers the supervisor can diagnose weaknesses and help teachers acquire judgment. The teacher needs little training to detect a sentence fragment or a comma splice, but he needs mature critical judgment to evaluate properly a piece of writing.

The supervisor often observes that in making a writing assignment the teacher has provided the students with cue items under a term like "discuss" and that although the writers have fulfilled the requirement and have supplied minimal cues, they have not produced any complex structures of thought. The student is ever apt to adapt himself to the demands of the teacher. In an individual conference with the teacher's theme file at hand, the supervisor can help the composition teacher learn the rudiments of thoughtful writing. The supervisor suggests practical ways for teaching rhetorical principles.

The supervisor may observe that some teachers meticulously correct mechanical errors but give little attention to organization and content. Frequently a teacher does not know how to call the student's attention to the larger elements of composition. After the supervisor has diagnosed such problems and has alerted the teacher to them, he may (as with lesson plans) ask the teacher in question to bring a set of uncorrected themes to the conference. A good teacher can convince his students that he is a true audience if his comments show that some sort of dialogue is taking place. A supervisor's guidance, in his accurate analysis of a paper and suitable suggestions, encourages the teacher to be attentive to important emphases.

Utilizing department meeting and bulletins. Supervision of all segments of the English program can profit from regular department meetings and regular bulletins. The supervisor should work to use department meetings for inservice training, not merely for dispensing housekeeping information. He can free time in department meetings to issue short, specific bulletins of instruction, which will help ensure staff compliance with department policy. Department decisions on policies should be written, and teachers should be urged to keep reports and bulletins on file.

THE EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

The term "evaluation" is psychologically unfortunate, but most teachers concede that their work is going to be judged. Often enough judgment is based on hearsay, the casual comments of students, or gossip in the faculty lounge. In general, teachers agree that firsthand observation by an interested and experienced staff member, working with the principal, can be fairer and more accurate. Reports from the supervisor, following classroom visits, personal conferences, and other observation, submitted promptly to the principal, help him to judge the overall competence of his staff and to anticipate needs for the future, as well as serve as the basis for individual evaluations. On the basis of such statements, the principal, working with the supervisor, can determine which staff members are qualified for tenure.

Most schools provide a form for the written evaluation of a teacher. The general criteria for evaluation do not vary greatly from one form to another. The principal categories include (1) subject matter competence, including knowledge and the application of knowledge; (2) skill in the classroom; and (3) personal qualities. Although few supervisors would quarrel about the validity of these general criteria, the emphasis placed on each may vary. In the first category, besides knowing a good deal about literature and rhetoric, the English teacher should be acquainted with current attitudes toward language and with recent studies of language. He should be independent of the textbook, knowing how to plan for the needs of his students, using relevant portions of a text wisely and discarding other. Classroom effectiveness demands a voice that neither stupefies nor annoys, ability to establish and maintain rapport with the students, willingness to face students without indulging personal quirks, ability to prepare and organize a unified lesson, and the willingness to face conscientiously the consequences of one's performance—namely, correcting themes, giving grades, and helping individual students. The term "personal qualities" is on every checklist but is rarely defined precisely. Such qualities should probably include a view of oneself as a professional teacher, coupled with energy, maturity, dignity, and cooperativeness. The supervisor can use a few reasonably effective questions to identify some qualities valuable in a teacher: Do his colleagues respect his opinions? If so, on what kinds of issues can he begin, execute, and finish a job? Is he attentive to opinion and capable of constructive disagreement? By and large, however, knowledge and ability are the most respected commodities in the teaching profession.

The dual responsibility for supervision and evaluation of teachers deserves the department chairman's serious attention and challenges his professional ability. Many public high schools have no chairman-supervisor, or have a nominal head with only routine functions. The chairman of an English department who is a supervisor must be given adequate time to plan systematic improvement of his department and to see that plans are carried out. He may have as few as one or two teaching periods a day in order to be free for supervisory activities and conferences. The supervisor's own qualifications must include hard knowledge, the information which enables any kind of authority to prevail over apathy, prejudice, and confusion. He must embrace attitudes of fairness, firmness, and fidelity to the staff. When members of a department recognize the supervisor's faith and confidence in their ability and his willingness to work with them, the environment will support the improvement of instruction.

ARTICULATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OUTSIDE THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

1. "English Departments in Relation to Other Departments"
   RUTH B. HERIN, *English Department Chairman,*
   Broad Ripple High School, Indianapolis, Indiana

2. "Articulation with Junior High School English Programs"
   EVELYN COPELAND, *English Consultant,*
   Fairfield Public Schools, Fairfield, Connecticut

English Departments in Relation to Other Departments

Ruth B. Herin
English Department Chairman
Broad Ripple High School
Indianapolis, Indiana

Many high school English teachers feel that student potential is lost because school departments do not plan cooperatively to help students achieve more in less time. This paper explores four practices intended to improve the relationship among high school departments and result in greater student achievement: (1) joint meetings, (2) a "building on" process with all departments, (3) courses that cross departmental lines, and (4) schoolwide "arts festivals."

The high school English course consists of many facets, but clearly the most important is the study of literature. Not one skill or combination of skills is to be considered equal in importance, for it is literature primarily which helps mankind to develop a philosophy for living and gives meaning to life. The other skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking—are secondary. These skills, however, make the English teacher's job unique in that in addition to literature he must also teach the techniques of each skill. It is the techniques which become adequate tools in life activities.

English teachers realize that despite the exact training they give students in each of the four skills, students' work in other departments does not always reveal such training. When these students turn in messy, inadequately prepared papers to other departments, the excuse is, "But this is not an English class." In all departments, including English, a similar lack of "carry over" is seen in day-to-day and semester-to-semester learning. If this weakness in the educational structure could be correct to permit "building on" previously learned knowledge from classes in all departments, many hours would be saved and greater student achievement would be realized in less time.

JOINT MEETINGS

If all departments have as their goal greater student achievement, and if greater student achievement rests partially upon working together for a "building on" process, then a meeting of departments, including the school librarian, can be productive.

This meeting together could be organized in different ways for different purposes: (1) Joint department meetings. The purposes of such meetings might be to provide insight for all teachers into the subject, to realize the scope and organization of subject matter, to learn the various methods of teaching the subject, and to exchange ideas and practices with the intent to "build on" the students' learning from other departments. (2) Meetings of department chairmen. The purposes of these meetings could be to discuss problems concerning student achievement and to seek ways to implement greater cooperation among departments. (3) Meetings of committees from various departments. The purposes might be to discuss common problems and to agree on ways of correlating study in the various departments. The following committees could be set up: teachers of American literature and American history; teachers of world history and of literature; teachers of literature, music, and art; teachers of business education and English. With periodic meetings of such groups, much progress should be made toward cooperation among departments.

"BUILDING ON" PROCESS

It seems reasonable to expect that from departmental meetings many ways in which to "build on" learning would be proposed. The following pages suggest various ways in which (a) the English department might "build on" students' learning from other departments; and (b) other departments might "build on" learning from the English classroom.

In high schools where speech teachers are available, they are asked to train students for contests, for special assembly programs, and for other public performances. If speech teachers are not available, English teachers probably more often than other teachers are requested to provide the training. Here is an opportunity for them to extend the students' learning.

To strengthen students' spelling, English teachers could include in their spelling lists words which are commonly and specifically used in other departments. Many departments have their own spelling lists from which they could take some of the more common words.

Besides adding words to spelling lists English teachers could reinforce the study of vocabulary by including in their course of study words in common use today which have been taken specifically from other departments.

Students enrolled in journalism classes contact more teachers and more departments probably than any other students. It is essential that the teacher of journalism, especially with the responsibility of the school paper and yearbook, keep informed about all departments. In such position journalism teachers hold naturally the most nearly unique place for correlating interests and learning from the various departments.

The pages which follow list mainly suggestions for expository writing as another method for English teachers to "build on" from other departments. The key word in most of the assignments listed is italicized.

From art

Compare a masterpiece of one artist with a masterpiece of another artist.

Compare two pieces of art by the same artist.
Discuss line, rhythm, emotion, and color in a work of art.

From foreign languages

Write a paper *discussing* the opportunities for a career in ____ (a specific foreign language).
Write both *literal* and *free* translations to observe similarities and differences in the languages involved.

From home economics

Explain in a paragraph the steps in making a garment.
Discuss the advantages of taking a course in home economics.
Describe a table which is laid properly for a luncheon or a dinner.

From industrial arts

Write a paragraph *proving* to a friend that he should enroll in ____ (wood shop, metal shop, drafting, or another course in industrial arts).
Write a paper *explaining* how wood shop (or another area of industrial arts) is valuable for an avocation or a vocation.
Write a paragraph *explaining* how to use a ____ (specific tool).

From mathematics

Write a paragraph *explaining* each step in the solving of a problem.
Write a paper *discussing* the relative merits of the new mathematics.
Outline the steps in solving a problem. (Watch parallelism and subordination.)

From music

Interpret the emotions in one movement of a symphony.
Interpret the various rhythms of a piece of music.
Criticize a recording of a piece of music.
Explain by example why or how one musical selection creates different emotions in different people.

From physical education

Explain how to climb a rope, do a head stand, or perform a pushup.
Explain a difficult dance step.
Compare the performances of two or more Olympic contenders.

From science

Write a paper *discussing* an experiment, *stating* what it proves and *explaining* the value of such knowledge.

Outline in detail the steps in a specific experiment. (Watch parallelism and subordination.)
In a paragraph *explain* how to set up equipment for a specific experiment.

From social studies
Write a paragraph *defining* and *illustrating* propaganda.
Write a paragraph *differentiating* between direct and indirect taxes.
Write a paper *comparing* the effectiveness of the newspaper and the radio as news media.

Often papers of such kinds serve better as writing assignments in the various subjects, rather than in English. But they illustrate how differing problems in composition may be applied to several subject areas.

In some high schools, various departments correlate their work by allowing students' term papers or other long papers to receive credit in two departments. They also assign outside reading to students (and this is a common practice of English teachers) to correlate with that of other departments, and, frequently, the student is allowed to receive double credit.

All teachers in high school evaluate the content of oral reports and essay papers; and many teachers include within their evaluation certain factors regarding form which will be mentioned later in this paper. There are many teachers of other subjects, even teachers of music and physical education, who insist on standard language usage, correct spelling, and adequate punctuation as well as proper manuscript form, logical organization, coherent sentences, and discriminating vocabulary. English teachers usually give to students specific information on how to study, which teachers of other departments might like to use so they could "build on" in the educative process. In fact, teachers of various subjects seek such information from English teachers for the sole purpose of "building on" learning which stems from the English classroom. Department chairmen might organize interdepartmental committees to consider these possibilities.

To "build on" a respect for the English language through the spoken and the written word, the teacher must first reflect such respect in his own practice. And, second, *every* teacher in the school needs to instruct and insist on the best speaking and writing from students. A general respect for language should be encouraged by all teachers. They should check basic spelling words (taken from their own department's list) in students' writing and should penalize the student for such errors in such words.

Most students can profit within each department on how to write essay tests. A guide such as the following has been used in one high school where it is discussed with students in all departments.

HOW TO ANSWER THE ESSAY QUESTION

1. Read all the questions through first unless there is a large number of questions, each requiring a short answer.

2. Make up your mind quickly on optional questions. Don't waste time worrying about your decision.
3. Answer first the questions you are certain you know, leaving plenty of space for answers to omitted questions. After each answer leave four or five lines for additional thoughts.
4. Concentrate upon one question at a time. Don't try to think ahead while working on a question.
5. Be sure you know exactly what is wanted before you begin to write.
6. Think more and write less. Teachers are usually impressed by brevity, conciseness, and accuracy.
7. If you do not know the answer to a question, try to reason it out.
8. Begin your answer to each question with one or more summary sentences. Restate part of the question in the first sentence. Never, never begin an answer with "it is when" or "it is because."
9. Be familiar with what the directions require. Know the meaning of the key words: *Name, describe, compare, contrast,* etc.
10. Never turn in an examination paper without checking it thoroughly. Check it for spelling, punctuation, neatness, and also reread answers to be sure they say exactly what you mean. Be very careful about changing answers; if you are in doubt, rely on your first answer.

To avoid confusion teachers in some high schools agree also on uniform manuscript style.

If students are forewarned about simple errors which occur with regularity in writing, and are expected to eliminate such errors in *all* their papers, their writing should noticeably improve. A basic test or review of such errors if distributed in all departments may help alert subject teachers to specific problems. Unless subject teachers actually use opportunities to direct the attention of their students to such problems in writing, such lists, of course, will have little ultimate value.

The principal of Broad Ripple High School asked the English department to prepare a list of fundamentals for all departments, and requested each teacher *to read and follow its instructions. The list is* a permanent addition to the teachers' handbook, which every teacher has in his possession. The list follows.

SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE LANGUAGE SKILLS IN ALL SUBJECTS

Language skills are basic to all learning. To improve these skills each teacher should impress his students with the value of correct communications. No teacher should say, "This is not an English class; therefore, I do not deduct for errors in English." Without the cooperation of all departments, students will not improve their reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

The administration has requested the English department to state specific ways in which all teachers can help students to improve their language skills. The suggestions follow.

1. Every instructor should teach students *to think as they read* and *to think as they listen.*
2. "Each teacher is a teacher of reading." Since reading techniques vary with subject matter, each teacher should be responsible for instructing students in those methods of reading and of studying which are best suited to each department.

3. Each department should list words peculiar to its specific area. Teachers should insist that students not only know the spelling and meaning of the words but also use the words intelligently.
4. In every class students should speak distinctly and answer in complete sentences with no repetitious assistance by the teacher.
5. All teachers should include in each test at least one essay question to be checked for logical development and for mechanics. Teachers of content subjects should give essay tests frequently.
6. All teachers should deduct from the grade of a student's test or other paper a specific number of points for incoherent or incomplete sentences, for mispelled words, and for obvious errors in grammar.
7. Each sentence should have correct end-of-sentence punctuation.
8. Each instructor should teach the skill of note-taking and insist upon students' taking readable notes.
9. Teachers should require that assignments be written neatly in ink on 8½ x 11 paper.
10. Each student should use the standard endorsement (with no abbreviations) written in the upper right-hand corner of the paper.

Standards by which compositions are judged should be set forth by the English department and followed by all other departments. A joint meeting of two or more departments could be held to discuss composition grading.

Many teachers use correction symbols as a shorthand to mark essay papers. The same symbols used by all the teachers in a high school may soon impress students of their errors, especially the repeated errors. However, determination of how widespread agreement should be on correction symbols is probably best left to interdepartmental committees who might submit their recommendations to each department for consideration.

The research paper poses special problems in interdepartmental cooperation. Teachers in some high schools defer requiring students to prepare library research papers until after the essential skills have been reviewed in English. Other schools work out patterns of interdepartmental cooperation which provide for specific locational skills to be taught through library papers in different classes—say in English in grade ten, in science in grade eleven, and in social studies in grade twelve. Interdepartmental committees may well be established to review and make recommendations to resolve the controversy over requiring long research papers in any high school class. Other such committees, with teachers of English participating but not dominant, might work out guidelines for problems in writing the research paper. For example, most students have great difficulty in learning how to limit the subject for the paper so that the subject may be treated adequately within the required number of words. Interdepartmental guidelines for selecting and limiting a subject may assist teachers of all subjects to help students with the problem.

Guidelines developed by teachers from two or more departments may also help students to evaluate the reading and reporting of nonfiction, biography, and magazines, in any class where such assignments might be appropriate. A useful series of such "yardsticks" has been published in *Practical English.*[1]

Courses That Cross Departmental Lines

When we think of crossing department lines, three types of programs come to mind: core teaching, team teaching, and the teaching of a humanities course. Core teaching crosses departmental lines, but the two or more subjects are taught by one instructor. Team teaching can (but does not always) cross departmental lines, and it involves more than one teacher, each considered an authority in his subject or subject area. These teachers together plan, instruct, and evaluate. The humanities course in high school often utilizes team teaching to take advantage of special competencies within the faculty. The humanities course is limited in its subject areas whereas core and team teaching may be done in any suitable combination of areas.

The main criticism against core teaching is that the teacher usually emphasizes the subject in which he is most interested, leaving a deficiency of learning in the other subjects. Team teaching is criticized for lack of planning, focus, and direction. The criticism leveled against the humanities course is the possibility of its promoting fragmentation, which in turn can lead to student frustration and lack of learning.

Variations of all three types of programs are found among many schools. Regardless of the variation or type, the basic purpose of a correlated study involving literature, for example, would be to develop broad concepts of life through depth and breadth of study. Such purpose requires the direction to be amply clarified, the focus to be kept clear, and the conclusions to be explicit. These criteria call for exceptionally careful planning by the teacher or teachers involved. With these criteria met, a humanities course which, for instance, develops as one unit the tragic view through literature, history, art, and music should make a deeper impression on a student than would the same concept developed in any one of the four areas alone.

Arts Festivals

Some schools present annually for the school and the community a program commonly known as an Arts Festival for recognizing the work of students enrolled in the fine arts and in some schools the practical arts. Much work by students and teachers from many departments goes into the preparation for such an evening, but this opportunity for students, their parents, and their friends to see and read the work of students is an excellent way to advertize the success of a department.

The arts festival at Broad Ripple High School, though now modified, began as a fine arts salon which featured for about three days the best in creative writing, drawing, painting, sculpturing, jewelry work, musical composition, and the dance. The work in writing and in art was judged by qualified persons outside the school. Parents, teachers, students, and friends were invited to attend and to observe the work which was displayed in the gymnasium, in the foyer, and in the corridors. During the program the principal welcomed the group and explained the purpose of the Arts Salon. A winning musical composition was sometimes played or sung; a poem, short story, or another winning paper was read; and a creative dance performed. Finally a representative from each department awarded first, second, and third place ribbons to the student winners.

---

[1] *Practical English,* February 3, 1954 (biography), April 20, 1960 (magazines), and March 1, 1961 (nonfiction).

The conscientious following of these four practices by all departments should result in a more effective relationship among high school departments, and from such relationship greater student achievement should emerge. Student potential can be increased if all high school departments join forces to increase student carryover from the day-to-day learning in departments. Inasmuch as the English department is the largest department and has as one of its duties the teaching of the proper use of the four skills, which are common ground to all departments, the English chairman and his department should point the way toward seeking greater cooperation among all high school departments.

Articulation with Junior High School English Programs

Evelyn Copeland
English Consultant
Fairfield Public Schools
Fairfield, Connecticut

> "... but something ere the end,
> Some work of noble note, may yet be done,
> Not unbecoming men that strove with Gods."

Confucius has said that the best way to begin a journey of five thousand miles is to take the first step. If the destination of the program for English is effective reading and writing, the first step is taken in kindergarten when a child finds an object whose name begins with *B*, and the teacher tapes the name *box, blocks, beads,* or *blue balloon* to the thing it represents. The first steps are taken when the word *boo* creeps into a Halloween scribble story and when the first grade teachers reads "Godfrey Gordon Gustavus Gore" or "Tiger, Tiger, Burning Bright."

The journey progresses from the first steps through elementary and intermediate grades to junior and senior high school; from scribble stories to controlled exposition; from folk tales to modern drama. The success of the journey depends to a large extent upon the bifocal vision of each teacher from kindergarten through grade twelve and upon the bifocal vision of the curriculum itself. A teacher has bifocal vision when he is aware of the skills that have already been taught and upon which he can build, of the materials and skills for which he is responsible, and of the part that these skills will play in a child's learning one, three, or six years hence. He sees the immediate clearly and can with equal clarity scan the entire itinerary. A curriculum has bifocal vision when a unified, developmental course of study moves from grade one to twelve without serious omissions or idle repetition.

Two questions arise immediately. How does one acquire bifocal vision and who builds the sequential course of study? The answers seem obvious. The teachers build the course of study and, while building it, the teachers acquire bifocal vision. But the answers, of course, are not as easy as they are obvious. Who will be responsible for the overall view? Who will be responsible for bringing together teachers from different departments and different buildings? Although the principles discussed in this paper are applicable wherever pupils move from grade to grade, this discussion will be limited to articulation between junior and senior high schools.

The recommendations will suggest some answers for six questions: Who is responsible for articulation between junior and senior high schools? What kinds of meetings are profitable? Can literature be coordinated? How can composition be coordinated? Need language be coordinated? How can the administration help?

Who Is Responsible?

An understanding of each other's work, responsibility, and goals in junior and senior high school does not occur fortuitously. Nor is it likely to be effected by asking one school or even one already busy person in either school to assume the responsibility of bringing about such an understanding. Underlying all the recommendations in this paper is the principle that an effective sequential program is the responsibility of all teachers under the leadership of someone whose full time assignment is to develop curriculum for English from the first consonant to the last precís. In Fairfield each academic subject has a curriculum consultant or coordinator. He is a member of the teaching staff with no administrative responsibilities; his only assignment is to work with teachers and build curriculum from kindergarten through grade twelve. He visits classes, works with new teachers, gives demonstration lessons, arranges for visits between teachers, and acts as liaison between the staff and the administrator who supervises and who assumes responsibility for book inventories, orders, and distribution. The consultant is a resource person, previewing new books, films, and recordings. He keeps in touch with professional activities, involves the staff in activities outside their own department, makes recommendations for the budget, implements committee work, plans department meetings. He usually teaches one class. Also working in the program and helping with all subjects are a full time reading and a full time library consultant. All of these consultants with the director of instruction and the assistant superintendent form the curriculum committee for the town.

What Kinds of Meetings Are Profitable?

One consultant cannot be omnipresent, nor need he be. Staff representatives will form steering committees and provide leadership within and between schools. All junior and senior high school chairmen, for instance, may form a consultant's cabinet. One representative from each grade can provide another cross section for planning with the consultant, as will specialists for each phase of the program—literature, composition, and language—or each ability group if classes are grouped homogeneously. In this way the consultant has a number of persons who will act as liaison. The result should not be all chiefs and no Indians, but rather a fluidity of responsibility. The more people that the consultant can turn to for help, the more leadership he has appealed to for building and coordinating the curriculum. In addition, working through representatives frees the consultant for time in the classroom—observing, demonstrating, suggesting, listening, and encouraging.

In close touch with many teachers, the consultant is in a position to arrange a very different kind of meeting from those with steering committees. He can match strength with strength or couple weakness with strength in informal meetings of two or three people across school and department lines. For instance, he can arrange for a junior and a senior high school teacher, both strong in composition, to exchange ideas and to form a nucleus for a committee on composition. Or he can arrange for the senior high school teacher who asks, "What *do* they teach in junior high school?" to spend a day finding out how junior high school pupils think. This sort of exchange with many variations—even to exchanging classes for a week—is another profitable way to improve articulation.

To coordinate junior and senior high school departments, staffs often need to study one topic throughout a series of meetings. One year the Fairfield staffs chose to reexamine the literature section of the course of study. Two professors from nearby universities spoke at general meetings during the year. First, Edward Gordon, Director of Yale's Master of Arts in Teaching Program, discussed techniques for teaching literature. Early in the second semester Frederick Stocking, head of the Department of English at Williams College, demonstrated ways of teaching poetry.

Each general meeting was followed within a few weeks by sectional meetings, one for each grade. Each teacher brought one assignment and lesson plan demonstrating at least one of the principles of the previous lecture. The teachers discussed the assignments, and each went away with seven or eight potential lesson plans. A follow-up of these meetings brought together teachers of two or three consecutive grades to consider the relative difficulty of assignments. Planning here crossed the lines of junior and senior high schools.

This series of meetings culminated with the question, "What is a good examination question for literature?" The last meeting of the series reviewed, by grades, the end-of-year tests, with sample responses, published in 1963 by the Commission on English. A discussion of the pertinence for the Fairfield course of study resulted in a suggestion that each teacher make his final examination available for comparison and evaluation. And there was the topic for the next year: Building a Good Test for Literature. By the time every grade in junior and senior high school writes one good end-of-year test, good enough to be approved by the grade before and after it, much progress will have been made toward building a sequential course of study.

Inservice courses in any phase of the curriculum—poetry, composition, linguistics, making tests, motivation—also encourage articulation by bringing together voluntarily teachers from several schools and grades. Here teachers work more intensively than is possible at a general meeting, and from these courses usually come the people who write guides and courses of study in the summer workshop.

Either inservice courses or general staff meetings might profitably reach beyond the immediate school system. By pooling their resources, three towns can triple the number of paid speakers each could afford alone, and three times as many people can benefit. Several communities have already tried this pooling of their human and financial resources with rewarding results. When junior and senior high schools are inspired together, they should be able to build together. Techniques and questions differ little from grade to grade. "What human resources did the characters use?" is as good a question in the sixth grade for *The Swiss Family Robinson* as it is in the eleventh grade for *Giants in the Earth*. The significant difference as pupils grow is in the quality of answer and the maturity of materials used to challenge their new depths of understanding.

How often should junior and senior high schools combine meetings? As often as their stamina permits and profitable meetings can be planned. Perhaps six weeks in succession; surely two or three times a year. The important thing is that through combined meetings the two groups work together and that with similar techniques and complementary materials they travel toward common goals.

CAN LITERATURE BE COORDINATED?

Given time, the will to do, leadership, and flexibility in meetings, an English staff should be able to coordinate a literature program from the first nursery rhyme to the last Greek drama. After the combined staffs have carefully planned and accepted their long range goals, they are ready to consider the best method for classifying literature. Will the literature be studied chronologically, sociologically, geographically, in correlation with history, by theme, by genre, in conjunction with the other arts? Whatever classification is agreed upon will determine the titles to be studied, the distribution by grades, and the specific goals for each year.

A textbook committee, with at least one representative from each grade, should be responsible for reviewing and recommending books, keeping the literature list up to date, and avoiding the duplication of titles. This latter is particularly important in the articulation between junior and senior high schools where a title appropriate for sixth or seventh grade is also a commendable choice for retarded readers in ninth or tenth grade. One function of the textbook committee is to see that a title does not appear for class study in two different grades. If, for example, *Call of the Wild* appears in two places, the textbook committee might suggest that one group substitute *Call It Courage*, *The Incredible Journey*, or *The Sea Wolf*. Teachers' tastes and pupils' needs will require many titles for every grade.

Idealistically a curriculum should grow from seed to fruit, but in reality staffs often find themselves grafting persimmon and pomegranate. In one town where the long range goal is the ability to read a variety of literary forms with appreciation and enjoyment, the senior high school studies literature by genre; pupils study examples of six types of literature intensively each year. After implementing this program the junior high school teachers considered ways to improve pupils' preparation for high school. They studied the high school curriculum and met with teachers in both intermediate schools and first-year teachers in high school. After a year of investigation and contemplation, they abandoned their anthologies and bought such titles as *Tom Sawyer, Treasure Island, My Friend Flicka, Swiftwater, Old Yeller, Midsummer Night's Dream, The Wonderful Winter, Little Britches,* and a poetry anthology. They then set up three specific goals for each year, goals that challenge the pupils beyond the obvious questions of *what* into the tantalizing questions of *how* and *why.* The new curriculum gives direction in studying each piece of literature, introduces junior high school pupils to whole pieces of literature, and provides for a smooth transition into senior high school.

With the blueprint of the curriculum completed from the long range objectives to the specific materials and immediate goals, the time comes to write the course of study and the guides. The thinking has been done in staff meetings and enriched in inservice courses. The actual writing is a time-consuming process most effectively done by individuals, small committees, and workshops, reporting to the general staff periodically for confirmation or further direction. A few junior and senior high school teachers working out lesson plans together in a small workshop can achieve unity and consistency in a series of literature guides.

With long range goals, then, that are compatible with the philosophy of the school and department, an English staff can decide upon a basis for classifying literature, select titles appropriate for each grade, and set specific immediate goals in a coordinated program for junior and senior high school. The course of study and the individual guides put the thinking and planning into forms readily available to teachers and supervisors. These provide for bifocal vision. The vision, however, should be of an itinerary not sacred and immutable but always subject to reconsideration and revision.

How Can Composition Be Coordinated?

That one learns to write by writing is, at best, a half truth. Pupils who write daily with no carefully discussed assignment, no well developed sequence, no directed discussion of writing skills are not likely to become skilled workers. How, then, can a sequential program be developed? First, junior and senior high school teachers should agree upon the answers to some general questions. For example, when should a formal study of composition begin? How often should pupils write? How long should assignments be? What skills can be isolated and taught singly? Should assignments move from short to longer papers? What proportion of the writing should be expository and what part imaginative?

When the general questions have been answered, specific skills can be isolated and assigned throughout the junior and senior high school years. Decisions should be reached as to when such things as unity, order, coherence, emphasis, controlling idea, proportion, point of view, tone and style will be introduced, stressed, and built upon. When will simple identification, note-taking, figurative language, precis, and paraphrase be introduced? Or methods of developing paragraphs—definition, example, comparison and contrast, analysis? How will particular forms of writing fit most naturally into the literature program—description, character sketch, autobiography, reports, source papers, criticism? When will the emphasis move from single sentences to single paragraphs to a five-paragraph essay? Surely a course that teaches a discipline whose effectiveness depends upon unity, order, and coherence should itself be unified, ordered, and coherent. By organizing from the most essential to the least essential or from the least sophisticated to the most sophisticated or by whatever method chosen, teachers can bring order and coherence into a cumulative approach to composition.

By the time specific skills and methods have been allocated, each teacher has obtained some bifocal vision. He knows what skills he can build upon and for what he is responsible. With the *what* decided, attention turns to the *how*. Since pupils resist composition when they have too little preparation for it, teachers must devise a variety of creative ways to show pupils how to collect, sort, and limit ideas; how to make a working skeleton; how to combine content and order to produce a creative piece of writing. Remembering that even familiar material is difficult to organize, teachers must keep reminding pupils that a particular principle *is* applicable to a new assignment. The skills must be taught consciously and conscientiously week after week, year after year. Cooperative planning from the junior high school through the senior will help to produce challenging variety in the constant repetition.

After the staffs have decided how to create continuity and variety in assignments, one other *how* still remains: how to evaluate compositions. Evaluation is a subject for mutual concern and perhaps outside help for it is not as subjective a process as is sometimes believed. Uniformity and objectivity bear a direct relation to clarity of directions and purpose in an assignment. Teachers who read the English Achievement Test of the College Entrance Examination Board or the Advanced Placement Test in English achieve remarkable uniformity in reading thousands of essays. If a school does not have a reader of either test, it might invite one to a general staff meeting to explain how readers evaluate expository writing. If a school gives an Advanced Placement course, it can send a representative to the national meeting to learn in detail how each question on the test is read. The principles for reading objectively are as applicable to junior high school paragraphs as they are to Advanced Placement Examinations. Agreement on standards of correction, on the levels at which writing skills are learned, and the nature of assignments will result in effective articulation between junior and senior high schools.

NEED LANGUAGE BE COORDINATED?

All phases of language—vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, usage, grammar—grow out of and along with a sequential program for literature and composition. Diction, tone, connotation, and style can hardly be studied independently from vocabulary, or vocabulary from literature. Grammar and sentence structure do not exist separately from coordination, subordination, parallelism, and antithesis. Spelling and punctuation are conventions that pupils must observe in both reading and writing. Since language, literature, and composition are inextricably involved, junior and senior high school teachers should determine together what language skills will best serve their goals for effective reading and writing and how these skills can be taught cumulatively without serious omissions or idle repetition.

If the junior and senior high schools are to achieve an articulated program, the teachers must ask and answer some basic questions about English instruction. They should ask first of all why they teach language, what purpose they want language to serve, how important they really think spelling is, what kind of grammar they want to teach, and what relation usage bears to grammar. Answers must be found in the light of their own philosophy, their own pupils, and their own goals. The search for answers and a consensus will contribute to articulation.

Professional journals have much to say about traditional, structural, and generative grammar. Alert staffs should be informed and be able to build a coherent language program that will best serve the needs of their students.

Another way to achieve coordination in language is to have teachers devise a series of language tests to be given at the beginning of each year. Fairly short, interlinear exercises given as practice in proofreading will determine the strengths and weaknesses of a new class. The cooperative planning for these tests will reiterate for the teachers what each grade has agreed to emphasize, and the administered tests will indicate what competencies have lapsed over the summer and need to be reenforced before new lessons are taught. Such tests have the added advantage of making pupils feel that the present class is based on the past but is moving toward the future. Perhaps the pupils, as well as the teachers and the curriculum, will acquire bifocal vision.

How Can the Administration Help?

If the consultant spends his time building curriculum, he will look to the administration to supervise and to help implement it. In Fairfield the division of schools into houses provides an administrative housemaster for approximately every twenty teachers, and he spends fifty percent of his time supervising. Familiar with the sequential course of study, a housemaster may ask any teacher how his lesson is related to the specific and long range plans of the department. Should a particular class or teacher seem to be falling short of the general goals, a reminder may suffice, or the administrator may ask the consultant to work with the teacher.

The administration can help, too, by keeping the load of the English teacher to that prescribed by the National Council of Teachers of English of no more than one hundred pupils in no more than four sections. This limit is as important in the junior high school as it is in the senior. The administration should assure English teachers also of two planning periods during the school day. In addition, the administration should see that the English department has one floating English teacher, one more than the enrollment requires. This teacher should be a full time, master teacher who substitutes for teachers who are relieved by the day or week to observe or work with others within the junior-senior department.

An Instructional Materials Center in some mutually accessible area can contribute to a coordinated program. Here teachers can browse in a curriculum library of professional books and magazines as well as sample texts from publishing companies. They can preview or review films and records that are shared by schools or study a complete catalog, by grade and subject, of all films and records owned by or available to the schools. Here, too, teachers should be able to find extra copies of all guides and courses of study.

The last suggestion is that the administration give its unstinted support for an adequate budget. In addition to providing for a permanent substitute for interclass and interdepartment visiting, an adequate budget should provide for ample clerical help and for salaries in summer workshop where the plans, sketched during the school year, can be developed. An adequate budget should subsidize expenses at professional meetings and for professional study for, if junior and senior high school teachers are to build together, both must be encouraged to seek stimulation in the creative thinking of others in the profession.

The road to a well articulated English curriculum between junior and senior high schools is long, but the best way to begin is to take the first step. The journey started, we may find, like Ulysses, that we like the adventures and will not want to rest from travel. At least "some work of noble note may yet be done."

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

SPECIAL REPORTS AND COMMENTARY

1. "The Chairman in Relation to Administrators and Supervisors"
   Charles B. Ruggles, *Consultant in English*
   Phoenix Union High School System, Phoenix, Arizona

2. "Implications of the USOE Conference of Supervisors of English for High School English Departments"
   Sue M. Brett, *Specialist in English*
   U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

3. "Cooperation between Secondary Schools and Colleges"
   Robert W. Rogers, *Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences*
   University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

The Chairman in Relation to Administrators and Supervisors

Charles B. Ruggless
Consultant in English
Phoenix Union High School System
Phoenix, Arizona

The responsibilities of the English department chairman, supervisory personnel, and school administrators in the development and support of an effective English program do not exist separately from one another. Their responsibilities to English classes must complement one another despite school size, the organizational pattern of a school, and the organization of a district.

The delineation of responsibilities in a school system has long been predicated upon some interpretation of the military line and staff concept. The line personnel can describe their responsibilities in terms of decision and power; the staff personnel can describe their responsibilities in terms of advice and presence. The designation of the supervisor or the department chairman as either staff or line is dependent upon administrative philosophy. Perhaps the supervisor and the department head can function effectively under either administrative philosophy with local variation in degrees of emphasis; the important thing is that the English specialist has opportunity to make his peculiar contribution to the English program. Every school system might benefit from an investigation to determine if there exists a positive relationship between the strength of the English specialist's influence in an English program's operation and the excellence of product.

Call the English specialist in the school—and every school has someone who is so-named, either tacitly or specifically—line or staff, his vital responsibilities are the same, whether the school's organization requires they be phrased in terms of important voice and considered advice or in terms of explicit authority. The responsibilities of the department chairman should include these key areas:

Identifying departmental personnel needs and selection of teachers most likely to meet these needs;

Orientation of new teachers to the English curriculum and department procedures;

Supervision of the classrooms;

Evaluation of the teacher's competence in the classroom;

Development of a set of policies for the department's operation;

Assignment and scheduling of teacher duties within the department;

Development of curriculum guides and the selection of curriculum materials;

Inservice education of teachers;
Participation in subject matter professional organizations;
Evaluation of the program;
Interpretation of the program to the entire school, the administration, and the community;
Budgeting for the department–supplies, clerical needs, equipment, and curriculum materials;
Articulation with the local grammar schools and with significant colleges and universities;
Planning meaningful department meetings;
Serving as a liaison between the administrators and teachers;
Fitting the English program and department into the general curriculum program of the school.

None of these areas of activity proposed as the basis of defining a department chairman's role is his exclusive province. These responsibilities must be shared with supervisory and administrative personnel. The degree these responsibilities rest with the chairman depends upon a school's philosophy of administration and organization and upon the premise that the chairman should be a leader in his field. Unless there is leadership from an English specialist, it is doubtful that a most effective English program will develop and flourish in either the city high school or the small rural high school.

Evidence shows that there is widespread confusion about a chairman's function and that this confusion is caused primarily when a school system had developed its structure of influence without special concern and provision for the subject matter specialist. In a just completed survey of the role of the English department chairman in our nation's high schools, conducted by a special committee for the National Council of Teachers of English, chairmen report that in only 12 percent of their schools is the job of the department chairman formally described. In schools with a population of less than 1,000, the position is very seldom described; in schools with a population of over 1,000, the position is described in approximately one fourth of the schools. These figures are tallied from the reports from schools in which some individual was designated as department chairman. Many of the reporting chairmen admitted functioning as less than leaders, and repeatedly they wrote that a definition of the department chairman's responsibilities is necessary. Many remarked that their schools in attempting a definition had failed because conflicts developed about their responsibilities in relation to those of administrators and their own obligations as teachers. The department chairman can meet his obligations as a teacher if his class load is reduced to allow him to attend to details and to give leadership to the English program and if his responsibilities and those of the administrative staff are put in perspective by describing them explicitly and making provision in the school's organization for cooperative endeavor.

The department chairman who serves in more than the nominal capacity of answering department mail and distributing supplies can make a contribution in the selection of English teachers and their supervision. One fourth of the chairmen reported to the committee that they interviewed prospective English teachers, and only one sixth judged their voice in employing their own staff as of major significance. In fact, approximately one half said their voice was of no significance, whatsoever. Since the English teachers work more closely with their department chairman than with any other person, he should participate in the employment of teachers by examining credentials, interviewing, and making recommendations. The English teacher, who must work day by day with the department chairman, will have greater opportunity to make a good adjustment and to succeed when, prior to employment, he meets his chairman and discusses with him the English program in the school.

The relationship between the department chairman and his teacher is most important in developing and maintaining an English program. Every English teacher is supervised in some way. An important proportion of this supervision should come from the department chairman, who has firsthand knowledge about the problems of the English classroom and who, because he teaches himself, sees them as real and responds sympathetically. The department chairman can examine many problems with his teachers that a principal or general administrator can not. Few English teachers limit their influence to their own classrooms. Therefore, it is very true that the administrator may have a better overall view of a teacher's needs and his worth, but the situation does not warrant excluding the department chairman from the area of supervision. Both the administrator and the chairman can contribute to the effectiveness of the English teacher, and if their responsibilities are defined, the teacher will respect both the chairman and administrator for their support.

An alert department chairman observes daily the attitudes of the English teacher, his relationships with his students, his preparation, his strengths, his interests, and his teaching techniques. Observations made from a favorable vantage point carry with them some aspects of evaluation. The formal evaluation of the classroom visitation too often becomes the crucial test of a teacher's competence. The observer in the classroom frequently obtains an unrepresentative sampling of the teacher's competencies, and very frequently this sampling is done only by the administrator who does not have opportunity to observe the teacher daily in the many tasks that influence classroom teaching.

Having some responsibility for evaluation of teacher competence need not impair the department chairman's capacity to help either old or new teachers. His own daily experience in the classroom and his wider background as an English specialist allow him to examine knowledgeably curriculum, classroom organization, and pupil performance with his teachers. The department chairman who is left to operate as a resource person at the whim and convenience of his teachers does not realize his potential in supporting supervisors and administrators in evaluating teachers and in improving their competence.

In the previously mentioned study of high school department chairmen, 30 percent assess their role in the evaluation of teachers as one of major importance. Forty-four percent of the department chairmen visit the classes of their teachers, though such visits are a more frequent practice in schools with a population of over 1,000. Of those chairmen who do visit classes, the majority use the conference method instead of the formal report as a follow-up, an appropriate course of action since it encourages discussion that can lead to improvement and greater security of the teacher in the classroom. Thirty-seven percent of department chairmen who do visit their English teachers report that their visits are the most significant ones in their system.

The role of the department chairman is not a consistent one across the nation in relationship to important responsibilities like selection, supervision, and evaluation of teachers; nor is it a consistent one in administering the detail of a department, despite the fact many department chairmen look upon their jobs as nominal and confined to detail to assist the administration.

The department chairman is the best equipped person in a school to view an English teacher's strength in relation to the entire program of the English department; yet 41 percent of the chairmen have no responsibility for assignment of duties and classes within the department, 44 percent have some voice in this kind of scheduling, and 15 percent have sole voice. The department chairman's voice tends to increase with school size. In schools with a population of under 1,000, 50 percent of the chairmen have no role in teacher scheduling.

Obtaining English supplies should involve more on the part of the chairman than passing out paper, pencils, ditto carbons, and chalk. The teaching aids and supplementary teaching materials available to the English teacher greatly determine the depth and breadth of an English program. A composition book and an anthology alone do not give a student the extensive language experience he needs. The fiscal support provided an English department is crucial to its curriculum, yet only 41 percent of department chairmen have any responsibility for budgeting. Budgeting available moneys too frequently is unrelated to curriculum needs; budgeting too frequently is a practice based on expediency and mere sustenance for an English department.

The department chairman requires an assured flow of money into his department for teaching aids, supplementary materials, class sets of books, professional publications, and significant inservice experiences for his teachers. Not only does he need an annual allotment, which in many schools is one to three dollars for each pupil, but he also needs the assurance that there will be sincere effort on the part of administrators to provide money in excess of any regular allotment, when curriculum changes, new teaching practices and worthwhile student experiences are proposed for the English program.

Responsible budgeting and expenditure of money to support an English program obviously assumes responsible reporting by the department head and the supervising specialist to the administration. Sixty-two percent of English department chairmen say that they presently interpret the English program to the administrators. Fewer (30 percent) say they have responsibility for interpreting the English program to their boards of education and to the community.

Reporting and interpreting on a current program is a task that should be a responsibility of every English specialist. His reporting, however, should not be confined to the current program; he has an important responsibility to inform administrators of new developments in the teaching of English.

Careful consideration of new teaching developments by the administrators and the English specialist involves not only the merits and practicality of possible change, but also available funds and the wisest manner in which to spend them. Nor is the department chairman's obligation to report confined to his administrators. He must inform his teachers about new frontiers in the teaching of English, and he must provide any necessary inservice training required for efficient use of new curriculum materials and for the profitable inauguration of any change in the English program.

For the department chairman to function at the desirable level indicated in this article, he must be carefully selected. Department chairmen reported to the NCTE committee in charge of this project that they held their positions through appointment, election, seniority, and rotation. Any particular qualifications for the post certainly were not critical for that 19 percent who acknowledged their route to a department chairmanship was by election, seniority, and rotation. Of the 80 percent who became department chairmen by administrative appointment, only 5 percent indicated they received their appointments after being adjudged as meeting the qualifications established by their school systems for department chairmanships.

A definition of the department chairman's responsibilities in relation to those of supervisory personnel and administrators is necessary to give meaningful existence to the English specialist; and, equally obvious, an effort should be spent to establish the qualifications and personal characteristics of the good English department chairman. The criteria for his selection in a particular school system should be keyed to the specific definition of his responsibilities; however, these criteria seem reasonable as a basis for selecting English department heads:

Professional Qualifications

A broad liberal arts education

A major in English

A Master's degree in English or English education

Certification as a high school English teacher in his state, and supervisory certificate also, if required

Course work in these areas: composition and rhetoric; English, American, world literature, and literary criticism, with evidence of strength in some phase of literature; the history and structure of the English language; literature for adolescents; speech; secondary school curriculum; curriculum development in English; supervision; psychology of adolescence and learning

EXPERIENCE

Five years of successful English teaching, which include some experience at each of the grades in the secondary school

Participation in local, state, and national professional organizations devoted to the teaching of English

Noteworthy contribution to inservice education activities and English curriculum projects in his school

Supervision experience, perhaps as a grade level chairman or working with student teachers

PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Broad cultural background

Interest in the whole school

Interest in the relationship of the secondary school, especially the English program, to the grammar school and higher education

Scholarly interest in his field

Organizational ability

Respect from his colleagues

Ethical behavior and moral character

Leadership ability

The responsibilities of the English department chairman warrant serious attention not only because they are generally either poorly or not defined but also because the qualified English specialist with an adequate sphere of influence in a school is best equipped to alleviate the inadequacies that the general public obviously feels exist in the teaching of English.

The English department chairmen are anxious that their appropriate role and responsibilities be identified. In cooperation with administrators, who have studied organization and management, and with English specialists, who are adept in English curriculum development and the supervision of English teaching, the chairmen can become leaders in a school organization that gives them greater responsibility for improvement in the teaching of English.

Implications of the USOE Conference of Supervisors of English for High School English Departments

Sue M. Brett
Specialist in English
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

A new energy was added to the general drive for superior English teaching by the nationwide Conference of Supervisors of English, grades K-12, which met in February, 1964, at the United States Office of Education. The very fact that the conference had been called indicated progress. Supervisors for the first time pooled their experience to strengthen English teaching.

The results of this group action were immediate and important. The conference produced a helpful guide for establishing and improving supervisory programs.[1] The conference also passed a resolution calling for a similar meeting annually—an act which assures us that joint efforts will continue to be made. A conference is planned by NCTE immediately before its 1965 convention; another is scheduled for 1966 by the Office of Education.

The immediate purpose of the conference was to prepare recommendations for state departments of education and local school systems for improving English instruction through supervision. For three days the conferees designed and wrote recommended principles, problems, and procedures. The implications of these recommendations are clear. There appears to be general agreement among leaders in the field that adequate supervision of English is critically needed throughout the country—the more critically because of the general inadequacy of teacher preparation. Most teachers would profit much by having access to skilled leadership and by having inservice education programs tailored to their individual and group weaknesses. In some cases they could also profit by protection of their time against overgeneralized programs from which they derive little that is specifically useful to English departments. Practical guidelines drawn up by successful supervisors and others knowledgeable in English and education, and made easily available, should encourage the spread of supervision by English specialists.

In its recommendations, the conference made direct attacks upon the problems of both teachers and supervisors. The first problem dealt with the fact that in most systems the English program is not directed by an English specialist. It was pointed out that English department chairmen have been serving under the leadership of the principal only. They were therefore their own resources for development of the program. Since most teachers are overloaded and many inadequately prepared, teachers find the textbook curriculum and the traditional procedures not only tolerable but comfortable. Change is a threat, strongly resisted, and teachers drop farther behind in their teaching. A recommendation followed that the responsibility for directing statewide, countrywide, citywide, and schoolwide English programs and for supervising instruction should be delegated to well qualified English specialists only.

---

[1] Sue M. Brett, *Supervision of English, Grades K-12: A Resource Book for State and Local School Systems* (Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1965).

The relationships which a supervisor establishes with others, his philosophy, and his manner of working were recognized as matters of far-reaching consequence. As envisioned by the conferees, the supervisor is not an inspector, nor a spy, nor a bullwhip cracker; he is a leader in a joint enterprise with teachers, administrators, and the community. He directs the English program and supervises instruction. The supervisor-teacher relationships were considered of such importance that the question of whether supervisors should be expected to rate teachers came up more than once. The duty of rating was regarded as a handicap in working with teachers, though it appeared to be unavoidable. All conceded, however, that evaluation by supervisors does afford teachers a degree of protection against evaluation by others who can judge their work less competently. Moreover, the feeling was strong that the supervisor of English must be a specialist in all the teaching levels which he supervises.

The conference agreed that the supervisor of English should give these services which most teachers need: principally, inservice education programs designed both to deal with current teaching problems and to build backgrounds; leadership in curriculum content and design; and individual guidance, assistance, and encouragement. For the discharge of these duties, the supervisor himself must be well equipped. He must himself have sound and comprehensive backgrounds in English and education; he must be aware of resources to draw upon and use them in carrying on his program; and he must know how to use those resources well. But even though he has superior qualifications, he cannot do the work of more than one person. In a large system he must be supplied with an adequate staff of professional assistants and office personnel.

The status of the English supervisor or director in relation to other supervisors or directors and to the administrative officers was of particular concern. It was found that rank in the salary scale appeared to determine the influence of the supervisor. The size of his salary controlled whether his reports and proposals in behalf of English and English teachers would be given consideration. The conference recommended that his rank be equal to that of any other systemwide director or a high school principal.

Having given promise in its first recommendations that English supervisors will be persons of high caliber whom both teachers and administrators can accept with confidence, the conference turned to the problems, procedures, and practices of supervision. Inservice education received first attention.

To outline a program of inservice education the supervisor must view first the total background needed by an English teacher, then the gaps in backgrounds of the teachers being served, and finally the availability of resources for the program needed. For the convenience of the supervisor in making his plans, the conference recommended those courses considered essential for English teachers and others considered desirable. The lists include the following, which have until recently been entirely overlooked in most preservice preparation: advanced composition, the descriptive linguistics approach to English grammar, history of the English language, the teaching of basic and advanced reading skills, voice and diction, logic, semantics. It was the hope of the conferees that the recommended courses which teachers may have missed in their preservice preparation would be made available to them in the inservice programs.

The inservice education activities recommended in addition to the courses are the familiar blue-chip practices: systemwide conferences with special consultants, lecturers, panels, discussion groups; staff meetings for inspirational, informational, or problem solving purposes; workshops; curriculum projects; experimentation; systemwide study groups; demonstrations; supervisory bulletins; classroom observations and follow-up conferences. The conferees advised that special provision be made to keep teachers informed of research findings in the field of English instruction. They recommended further that, lest the supervisor fall behind the teachers, he continue his own education with diligence.

Appropriate time for inservice education activities is always a serious problem. Keenly aware of the weariness of English teachers at the end of a school day and of the competing pressures for their after school hours, the conferees ruled out after school as a satisfactory time. But what time is appropriate? After much discussion one recommendation concerned periods of time immediately before or after the school year, and/or summer institute sessions, with extra pay to teachers for all additional days or weeks. Another suggestion called for four-day teaching weeks with the fifth day for inservice education. Saturdays were regarded as a second best.

One eminent conferee made the point that regardless of their excellence, organized inservice education programs cannot meet all of the teacher's needs:

> The teacher must have some time for himself—to invite his own soul, to refill his own reservoirs. This he may do in an art gallery, or in a concert hall, or in a library. At the present time the greatest fault in English teaching lies in the fact that the people who are doing the teaching are not themselves readers. They are not themselves having experiences that are challenging or in any way comparable with those their students are having. Teachers must be allowed some time of their own to read and to further their education themselves.

The English curriculum must from time to time be given a complete rethinking and major rewriting, for the field advances, the world changes, and secondary school students reflect the changed world. The conference recommended step by step procedures for a large curriculum development and specified that not only all teachers but also selected representatives of the community be involved. In this way teachers are enabled to think along with the new program as it develops, and community support of a new program is increased.

To protect both teachers and pupils against large quantities of teaching materials that may not prove as useful as they first appear to be, the conference recommended that all materials be tried out before they are listed for general purchase.

Teaching conditions, which have a critical bearing upon the work of both the English teacher and the supervisor, were given serious consideration. The human relations environment must be good, the assigned responsibilities must be reasonable in quantity and appropriate in kind, and the physical facilities must be adequate for the work to be done.

The supervisory situation should provide assistance for the individual teacher when it is needed. Rarely can a systemwide supervisor serve all teachers. The conference repeatedly insisted that individual services must be provided through the appointment of a department chairman with supervisory qualifications and with supervisory responsibilities. The chairman whose only duty is to allocate the textbooks and distribute the supplies while he teaches a full program is not sufficiently functional as a supervisory aide. The chairman's teaching duties must be appropriately reduced to provide time for working with other teachers on their problems. The recommendation was stated as follows:

> On the secondary school level a department chairman who is highly knowledgeable in the field of English should be appointed in every school, and his work schedule should provide time for leadership activities in the department as needed. Such appointments should be the first step in the organization of a systemwide supervisory program.
>
> In systems too small to warrant systemwide supervision such department chairmen should direct the English program.

The workload of the teacher must be small enough to be handled with satisfaction to all concerned and leave time for the teacher to grow both by independent study and by organized group study. It was agreed that a teacher's assignment should not exceed 100 students in 4 classes, with two preparations, a homeroom, and one extracurricular activity. Within the total of 100 students, the classes should vary in size according to curriculum emphasis and student ability levels. A composition emphasis, for instance, requires a smaller class than a literature emphasis; slow learners require smaller classes than average and above average learners. Nonprofessional aides, especially theme readers, should be provided to ease the teacher's burden of paper marking and clerical work.

Though good English teaching can be done with a teacher on one end of a log and the student on the other, we no longer have a one to one teacher-pupil ratio, and for modern times modern teaching facilities are important. The last recommendations were concerned with the English area in the school building. They included specifications for model English classrooms and additional library and laboratory spaces. It was pointed out, however, that these recommendations are tentative; when new teaching situations and approaches develop, the physical environment must be adjusted to accord with them.

The implications of the Conference of Supervisors of English have been obvious throughout this review: the conference itself and every suggestion it made were efforts to support and improve departments of English. If the recommendations seem dead center and commonplace, it must be remembered that they are commonplace only in favored school systems where they are practiced. The nation's schools in general, as attested in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English,*[2] are not so favored. These guidelines, indicating what should be done to upgrade English teaching and how to do it, offered by educators who have tested their recommendations, are unique in the literature of English education. They may be expected to supply to school systems a persisting impetus to act for the excellence of English instruction, which the public earnestly desires for its high school children.

---

[2] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1961.)

Cooperation between Secondary Schools and Colleges

Robert W. Rogers
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

One of the most striking developments in American education during the past fifteen years has been the emergence of a variety of efforts—many of them highly successful—at close cooperation between teachers in the secondary schools and college teachers from the so-called subject matter areas. Most of us are not so young in chronological years that we cannot remember the situation which prevailed in, say, the 1930's. College professors moved in the shadow of the German tradition of the Herr Geheimrat Professor who bowed whenever he thought of himself, his learning, his dignity, his prestige. Interested only in a select few who wanted to go to college—and could afford to go—they felt no need to concern themselves with the education of the young and the innocent. Their business was to work with mature intelligences. Teachers in the schools, faced with the problem of coping with masses of students having diverse aims and limited aspirations, were perforce indifferent to the ideals of the professors. Since the vast majority of their students intended to move directly from high school into farming, industry, or commerce, their business had to be the education of students for life, not for college. Generally life in the 1930's meant labor, skilled or unskilled. Thus the colleges and the schools came to work on different and rarely intersecting planes—only professors of education showed any interest in the public schools.

Since World War II the situation has changed drastically. American society committed itself, in effect, to mass education beyond the high school; and, generally speaking, the tone of life required skills and competences far beyond what could be expected from formal education terminating at the age of sixteen or seventeen. Students appeared on college campuses in undreamed of numbers; and it quickly became clear that the ideals which influenced attitudes of earlier decades no longer obtained. The professor could not remain indifferent to the processes by which students who came to him in such large numbers were prepared for his classes; and the secondary school teachers found that most students in their classrooms were now heading for college. The impact of this discovery was reinforced by the work of educational psychologists who were showing so clearly that education is a total process, that education is not an activity to be neatly compartmented and stratified. What happens to the child in the first grade or kindergarten may do much to explain the kind of achievement he later makes in college classrooms. Thus what occurs in education at every level is of pressing concern to all.

Teachers are, regrettably, among the last to adjust their ways to changing circumstances; and the orientation has been difficult and slow. Attitudes and myths always die hard. Nevertheless, great progress has been made since 1950; and those of us in English have, to our credit, not been among the last to lay the old aside. Let me mention a few specific illustrations of what has been happening:

1. The University of Illinois annually appoints a high school teacher as Visiting Lecturer for the purpose of teaching and interpreting school problems to the rhetoric staff.
2. Universities like Illinois, Berkeley, and Yale plan annual articulation conferences in English to bring together high school and college teachers of English.
3. Iowa is working out a pilot program in advanced placement in rhetoric and composition for gifted high school students to supplement the regular advanced placement program in literature.
4. The English examination of the College En[illegible]ce Examination Board is now under revision with school teachers of [illegible]sh working with college teachers on the revision. The new examinatio[illegible]as been made necessary by improved instruction in high schools, such as is reflected in *End-of-the-Year Examinations,* the Commission on English publication, or *English Programs for High School Students of Superior Ability,* by the NCTE.
5. Indiana University's Department of English has a full-time coordinator of English who spends most of his time in the field working as a consultant with school groups.
6. The University of Washington has a specialist in English released half-time to coordinate advanced placement programs in the state.
7. The University of Michigan encourages its English faculty members to visit former graduates in the schools: Stanford, on the other hand, invites high school teachers of English to visit its freshmen classes in English.
8. At the University of Idaho, the chairman of English has organized traveling seminars of English professors to bring new insights to teachers in the field who cannot enroll in campus classes.
9. At Wisconsin, Indiana, Purdue, Florida State, Nebraska, Oregon, Illinois, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Northwestern, and Minnesota—to mention only a few—professors of English are being given released time from other responsibilities to work on new curriculum projects and new material.

An important point was reached in December, 1962, when the chairmen of the English departments in some eighty colleges and universities met at

Allerton Park, Illinois, and formally declared their willingness to share in the responsibility for the teaching of English. Here are some of their resolutions:

1. The preparation of teachers of English and their continuing education as teachers are among the important responsibilities of college and university departments of English. These responsibilities may call for the development of sustained programs of teacher education. Departments should regularly review and evaluate their training programs for teaching assistants and their courses designed for the preparation of high school teachers. Such efforts to strengthen the teaching of English should be accepted as professional obligations; hence their vigorous promotion should not be contingent upon the receipt of federal funds.
2. English teachers returning for postbaccalaureate study should be encouraged to enroll in courses in English and American literature and language. For those teachers who are ineligible to enroll in graduate degree programs, English departments should consider providing suitable courses and special graduate certificates.
3. The teaching of English and research in teaching will profit from joint efforts by specialists in English, English education, psychology, and other areas, and from cooperation, wherever this is appropriate, with such agencies as the United States Office of Education, state departments of education, and local schools and school systems.
4. Research in teaching and in the instruction of teachers can contribute to the same ends as a liberal discipline, inasmuch as teaching brings into focus the issues of literary and linguistic theory. Faculty members engaged in research in the teaching of English should be considered eligible for any reduction in teaching loads that is available for those engaged in literary or linguistic research, and the results should be evaluated by criteria comparable to those applied in literary and linguistic disciplines.
5. Teachers of English education should hold appointments in English departments whenever possible.
6. College and university departments of English should expand their programs of cooperation with elementary and secondary school teachers of English by providing, for example, more departmental consultants who will work with the schools and by developing special programs for teachers such as summer workshops, institutes, seminars during the regular academic year, and special conferences.

The event itself, and the resolutions arising from it, were valuable chiefly for their symbolic significance; but during the past two years more than two thirds of the college departments represented at Allerton Park have revised and strengthened their major programs for future teachers, as reported in the October 1964 issue of *College English:*

59 percent reported adding new courses for teachers, most frequently

advanced composition, structural or historical study of the language, or courses in literary analysis.

50 percent reported reviewing and reorganizing the undergraduate major to strengthen preparation in the content of English.

48 percent reported offering new extension or summer courses in English designed for teachers including late afternoon or evening offerings scheduled at times when teachers are able to attend.

An additional 30 percent reported organizing summer institutes for teachers of English.

19 percent have sponsored one-day and two-day conferences for teachers of English.

23 percent reported English faculty members engaged in research or curriculum development activities sponsored by Project English or outside institutions.

17 percent have designed new advanced degree programs for teachers, most often the Master of Arts in Teaching degree, but in one instance a Ph.D. in English education.

17 percent reported making additional faculty appointments in English education and the teaching of English.[1]

The United States Congress has passed an expanded version of the National Defense Education Act. It includes more generous loan provisions, with special consideration given to those who will enter the teaching profession, and a larger program of fellowships. It contains provisions for the support of the acquisition of equipment and materials needed in the teaching of English. It provides strong support for institutes, both summer and year-long institutes, for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualifications of individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising, or training of teachers of reading, geography, history, and English. The new act means in essence that the federal government has at last agreed to support education in a massive way. It is good that the importance of education has been so generously recognized; but the best use of this support is going to require efforts at articulation beyond anything so far attempted. Having the support is one matter; being able to use it effectively and wisely is quite another.

In view of these new responsibilities, we may well ask where we go from here. Clearly patterns of cooperation already developed will be utilized more extensively than ever before. We will see more exchange appointments, with secondary school teachers holding visiting appointments on college faculties. Colleges will make more appointments of persons who have as a part of their responsibilities liaison work with the schools. There will be more cooperative work on curricula and examinations; and there will be more vigorous efforts to disseminate information about college courses in the schools. And new patterns of cooperation are going to develop. The colleges will develop new patterns of extension work; and the electronic media will come to be used in the work of instruction and cooperation. We must not forget that so far the junior colleges have been largely left out of present arrangements; and ways of bringing them to a central position must be found. The colleges may develop demonstration classrooms or centers. Certainly there must be, and will be, more effective liaison with various kinds of supervisory personnel. In this connection one might note that the new NDEA may be interpreted as encouraging institute training for supervisors.

---

[1] James R. Squire, "The Profession Faces the Future," *College English*, XXVI (October 1964).

Past experience has shown that many of the best efforts at cooperation have resulted from proposals and requests initiated by high school teachers themselves; and the schools should be even more ready to approach the colleges with suggestions and requests for help. Such cooperation is particularly important with respect to the institutes which will soon be springing up in many places. Colleges can now receive the financial support they need; but they will require counsel concerning curricula from the secondary school teachers who have acquired special kinds of expertise. Above all, they will need help from the chairmen of high school English departments in recruiting participants who can profit from the kind of training institutes provide. For, unless such individuals are identified and encouraged to enroll in institutes, the existence of the institutes can accomplish nothing. Cooperation involves other measures also. For the real need of the profession is the recruitment of able young persons early in their school careers. One of the strengths of the National Defense Education Act is the breadth of its attack on problems of education; and it has not neglected to provide expanded opportunities for the support of students. Recruitment for the profession of teaching is a task which the high schools can share: all the money for loans and fellowships will serve little purpose if students arrive in the colleges without having acquired attitudes with respect to teaching, specifically the teaching of English, that will dispose them seriously to consider entering the profession. Students with ability must be identified in the schools; and they must be encouraged. The colleges also have much to do in the way of recruitment. They must devise means of sustaining the interest which the secondary schools may have aroused, of challenging students with new forms of instruction; and they must also make efforts at identifying talent among their freshmen and sophomores. If articulation fails to regard seriously recruitment of the young, it falls short of achieving the long term needs of the profession.

Articulation should, and will, come to include new and fruitful topics of discussion—or at least discussion directed along more coherent lines. We all know how often we are asked to meet, with articulation in mind, to discuss the present state of English; and every conference approaches the problem differently. How many organizations are there that concern themselves with a thousand small deliberations? There seems to be a great deal more heat than light generated; ordinary mortals as we are can only read the prescriptions, conclusions, summaries, and pontifical judgments of learned discussants, speakers, and resource persons; and we can only wonder what to do next. Hopefully the day will come when the profession produces a more coherent and coordinated plan of attack on its problems.

The future should bring more efforts at a redefinition of our roles as teachers of English. As the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Boyle, Minister for Education in Great Britain, has remarked, "English has in some ways been slow to develop a sense of identity." Although it has emerged as a major teaching subject during recent years and is involved in "almost every other subject or aspect of teaching and learning," we are curiously in doubt about our business. The teacher of English must teach reading, writing, ethics and morals, aesthetics and even social history; no wonder it is difficult for him to think out just what he ought to be teaching and why. For instance, there is a tendency to talk about composition, wrongly, as a technique rather than a subject; we look upon it as something that can be perfected by and for itself, quite without regard to the subject matter on which it is used. Thus writing too often comes to be thought of as training a student to express himself on unfamiliar subjects, and we fail to relate it in meaningful and direct ways to our other important business, the teaching of literature. We can make a greater effort to arrive at organic and unified concepts of our business as teachers, concepts that will bring closer together our functions as teachers of writing and teachers of literature and will at the same time make ours a definable discipline. We should hope to see a greater tendency to broaden discussions of articulation to include more than pragmatic measures, to attack some of the more basic problems, to consider even the extent to which curricula can and should be standardized.

Finally efforts at articulation in the future will also concentrate on achieving better conditions for the conduct of our professional business. Secondary school teachers and college teachers joining together can force some much needed improvements. We can push for better working conditions, which includes better salaries, lighter teaching loads, and sabbatical leaves. We can insist on higher standards of training and performance. Already we hear talk about qualifying examinations on a national scale for those who wish to present themselves as teachers of English. We can work to improve our own image. United we can be more firmly convinced of the dignity and importance of what goes on in the English classroom. We can remind ourselves of the importance of teachers in society and of Henry Adams' words: "A parent gives life; but, as parent, gives no more. A murderer takes life; but his deed stops there. A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." We must be sure that we aim at a goal which is more than competence; we must set our sights higher, trying to teach students the joy of being able to use language, the control of life and experience which that ability provides–what Archibald MacLeish had in mind when he wrote:

Bewildered with the broken tongue
Of wakened angels in our sleep—
Then, lost the music that was sung
And lost the light time cannot keep!

There is a moment when we lie
Bewildered, wakened out of sleep,
When light and sound and all reply:
That moment time must tame and keep.

That moment, like a flight of birds
Flung from the branches where they sleep,
The poet with a beat of words
Flings into time for time to keep.[1]

At the same time we must acquaint students with what Matthew Arnold called "the best that has been thought and said in the world." For, as the world now turns, on us falls the principal burden of introducing students, to most of the great civilizing concepts, ethical and aesthetic, which have shaped the thinking of Western man. The sciences and the social sciences have abandoned the past to us; philosophy as a discipline has become so technical and specialized that its influence is felt by only a few. The responsibility is a large one, one which may easily overwhelm us if we are not ready to meet it with imagination and vision, or if we concentrate on details at the expense of a concern for ultimate ends.

We cannot aspire to have "one aim, one business, one desire"; but we may hope to fluctuate less idly without term or scope.

---

[1] Archibald MacLeish, "Words in Time" in *Collected Works* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962). Reprinted by permission.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Recommendations for the High School English Classroom

THE ENGLISH CLASSROOM

The staff of the National Study of High School English Programs and the chairmen of high school English departments attending the Urbana and Cleveland conferences believe that every English classroom should be equipped with appropriate means and materials for effective instruction. Reference books, room libraries, filing cabinets, and special facilities for audio or visual presentation are among the materials needed to provide an optimum environment for teaching the English of today and tomorrow. Fully as important as having these materials, however, is having teachers trained in their proper and effective use. It is therefore incumbent on the school to provide for appropriate training in the basic classroom techniques of using the materials and equipment listed in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH CLASSROOMS

I. MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS FOR EVERY ENGLISH CLASSROOM

A. *Highly Recommended.* A regular subscription to each of the following periodicals for every senior high school English classroom.

The Atlantic. Atlantic Monthly Co., 8 Arlington Street, Boston, Mass. 02116.

Harper's Magazine. Harper's Magazine, Inc., 2 Park Ave., New York, New York 10016.

Literary Cavalcade. Scholastic Magazines, Inc., 50 W. 44th Street, New York, New York 10036.

New York Times Book Review. New York Times, 229 W. 43rd Street, New York, New York 10036.

New York Times Magazine Section. New York Times, 229 W. 43rd Street, New York, New York 10036.

The New York Review of Books. 250 W. 57th Street, New York, New York 10019.

Saturday Review. 380 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

One local newspaper.

B. *Desirable.* Classroom subscriptions to the following periodicals whenever possible. Starred items (*) are especially desirable in particular English classrooms (slow learners, special courses). Where these periodicals are available in the classroom, they should be available in the departmental English Center or the school library for classroom use.

American Scholar. 1811 Q Street N. W., Washington, D. C. 20009.

**Hot Rod.* Peterson Publishing Co., 5959 Hollywood Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90028.

The Illustrated London News & Sketch Ltd., Ingram House, 1315 John Adams Street, London W. C. 2, England.

Manchester Guardian Weekly. Manchester Guardian and Evening News Ltd., 3 Cross Street, Manchester 2, England.

The Nation. 333 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10014.

National Geographic Magazine. National Geographic Society, 17th and M Streets N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

National Observer. 11501 Columbia Pike, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910.

National Review. 150 E. 35th Street, New York, New York 10016.

New Republic. 1244 19th Street N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Newsweek. Newsweek, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

The New Yorker. The New Yorker Magazine, Inc., 25 W. 43rd Street, New York, New York 10036.

**Practical English.* Scholastic Magazines, Inc., 50 W. 44th Street, New York, New York 10036.

**Scope.* Scholastic Magazines, Inc., 50 W. 44th Street, New York, New York 10036.

**Seventeen.* 320 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

Time. Time, Inc., Time & Life Bldgs., Rockefeller Center, New York, New York 10020.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY BOOKS

A. For every well-equipped high school English classroom, approximately 500 selected individual titles (largely in paperback) appropriate to the grade and level of students should be provided.

B. A collection in every classroom of not fewer than 25 titles presenting epics, myths, fables, and similar reservoir literature suitable for reading at each grade level is recommended.

III. REFERENCE BOOKS

A. *Highly Recommended.* One class set of dictionaries, either sufficient copies of one dictionary for each student or multiple copies of five or six dictionaries. The staff of the National Study believes that students will learn to use dictionaries more effectively when several titles are available; however, many chairmen prefer one class set of a single title. In any event, three or four different abridged dictionaries are needed in each classroom, including:

Barnhart, Clarence L. (ed.). *American College Dictionary.* New York: Random House, Inc. 1959.

Friend, Joseph H., and David B. Guralnik (eds.). *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language* (college edition). Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing Co., 1959.

Merriam-Webster Seventh Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1963.

One unabridged dictionary, e.g., Gove, Philip B. (ed. in chief). *Merriam-Webster's Third International Dictionary,* Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam & Co., 1955.

Cousins, Norman (ed.). *March's Thesaurus-Dictionary.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958 *or*

Lewis, Norman (ed.). *Roget's Thesaurus in Dictionary Form.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1961 *or*

Roget, Peter Mark. *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1946.

Evans, Bergen, and Cornelia Evans. *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1957.

Fowler, Henry W. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage.* New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1965.

Nicholson, Margaret. *A Dictionary of American English Usage.* New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1957.

Bartlett, John. *Familiar Quotations.* Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Company, 1955 *or*

Stevenson, Burton. *Home Book of Quotations, Classical and Modern.* New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1959.

Thrall, William F. Addison Hibbard, Hugh Holman. *Handbook to Literature.* New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1960.

Alm, Richard (ed.). *Books for You* (1964 edition). New York: Washington Square Press, 1964.

Lueders, Edward (ed.). *College and Adult Reading List of Books in Literature and the Fine Arts.* New York: Washington Square Press, 1962.

Weber, Sherwood. *Good Reading.* New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1960. (Also New American Library of World Literature, Inc. paperback).

B. *Desirable.* If possible, copies of the following references should be placed in every classroom. If not available in every classroom, they should be available in departmental English Centers.

Benét, William Rose (ed.). *The Reader's Encyclopedia: An Encyclopedia of World Literature and the Arts.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1948 with 1955 supplement.

Bridgewater, William, and Seymour Kurtz (eds.). *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (3rd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Mencken, H. L. *The American Language.* (4th edition and 2 supplements abridged by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.) New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Perrin, Porter. *Writer's Guide and Index to English* (3rd ed.). Chicago, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1959.

IV. GENERAL EQUIPMENT

A. *Highly Recommended.*

- Bulletin board
- Chalk board
- Filing cases for student work
- Four drawer file
- Large worktables and chairs for conferences, group meetings, displays
- Lectern
- Movable desks and chairs for students
- Open *and* closed bookshelves and magazine racks
- Stand for unabridged dictionary
- Teacher's desk containing file drawer

B. *Desirable.* If possible English classrooms should have the following equipment. If necessary, such equipment may be accessible in the departmental English Center.

- Cupboard or drawer for maps, charts, etc.
- Display racks for magazines and paperback books
- Movable partitions or screens or seminar-type classrooms immediately available to the department
- Writing booths or listening booths unless other provision is made

V. ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT

A. *Highly Recommended.* Every English classroom should be equipped with the following equipment.

- Appropriate slides and transparencies
- Filmstrip projector
- Overhead projector
- Self-contained audio unit (phonograph, earphones and listening stations for up to eight students)
- Shades for darkening classrooms
- Tape recorder and tapes
- Television receiver where school receives ETV
- Wall screen for projection

B. *Highly Recommended Special Equipment for Reading Rooms Only.*

- **Individual Reading Pacers**
- **Specially selected room library of books**
- **Tachistoscope**
- **Variety of materials for individuals and groups (SRA Reading Laboratories, selected workbooks and individual drills)**

Appendix B

Recommendations for the High School Departmental English Center

THE DEPARTMENTAL ENGLISH CENTER

The staff of the National Study of High School English Programs and the chairmen of high school English departments attending the Urbana and Cleveland conferences believe that every English department should have an English Center sufficiently comfortable, accessible, and well equipped to encourage its regular use by English faculty members throughout the day. Appropriate furniture for informal gatherings, work tables and desk, conference and group meeting space, a depository for department files and equipment, a display of sample textbooks, the department's reference library, and facilities appropriate for brief respite—these are essential. Where schools have developed such Centers, the professional dialogue among teachers of English is considerably elevated, much important departmental business is conducted almost automatically, helpful exchanges among teachers occur, and the teaching of English in the school is noticeably improved.

Although the efforts of librarians, district curriculum coordinators and audiovisual specialists have helped to bring instructional materials to the attention of English teachers, such materials are frequently not available to the classroom teacher without considerable preliminary paper work and ultimate delay. Unlike more highly structured subjects, English depends on the imaginative and often spontaneous use of supplementary materials. It follows that the appropriate film or recording is used most effectively when it is immediately accessible to the teacher.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HIGH SCHOOL DEPARTMENTAL ENGLISH CENTERS

I. BASIC EQUIPMENT FOR USE IN THE ENGLISH CENTER

A. *Essential.*

- Adequate space to accommodate bookshelves, magazine racks, files, cupboards, book displays
- Departmental bulletin board
- Duplicator for teacher use
- Supply of paper, transparency materials, etc.

Typewriters
Work tables for teachers

B. *Desirable.*

Desks (essential if teachers do not have access to classrooms during conference periods)
Special conference rooms for small groups
Thermofax copier

II. BASIC EQUIPMENT AVAILABLE FOR CLASSROOM USE

A. *Highly Recommended.*

Flannel board
Overhead projector
Phonograph
16 mm sound motion picture projector
2 x 2 slide projector and individual viewer

B. *Desirable.*

One record cutter

III. PERIODICALS AND MAGAZINES IN THE DEPARTMENT CENTER

A. *Essential.*

The Booklist. American Library Association, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. 60611.
College Composition and Communication. National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61822.
College English. National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61822.
Elementary English. National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61822.
English Journal. National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61822.
The Journal of Reading. International Reading Association, P. O. Box 119, Newark, Delaware 19711.
The New York Review of Books. 250 W. 57th Street, New York, New York 10019.
New York Times Sunday edition. 229 W. 43rd Street, New York, New York 10036.
Paperbound Books in Print. R. R. Bowker Co., 1180 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.
The Reading Teacher. International Reading Association, P. O. Box 19, Newark, Delaware 19711.
Saturday Review. 380 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10017.
State English magazine, (e.g., *Illinois English Bulletin,* Illinois Association of Teachers of English, 100 English Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61803).

B. *Desirable.*

Abstracts of English Studies. National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61822.

American Literature. Duke University Press, College Station, Box 6697, Durham, N. C. 27708.

The American Scholar. 1811 Q Street N. W., Washington, D. C. 20009.

Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books. 5835 Kimbark Avenue, Room 206, Chicago, Ill. 60637.

The Clearing House. Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, New Jersey 07666.

College Board Review. College Entrance Examination Board, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.

Current Biography. H. W. Wilson Co., 950 University Avenue, Bronx, New York 10452. (Yearbook, 1946-1963).

The Explicator. Box 10, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C. 29208.

Harvard Educational Review. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Kenyon Review. Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio 43022.

Library Journal. R. R. Bowker Co., 1180 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10036.

London Times Literary Supplement. The Times Publishing Company, Ltd., London, E. C. 4, England.

Modern Language Journal. 7144 Washington Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

PMLA. The Modern Language Association of America, 4 Washington Place, New York, New York 10003.

Shakespeare Quarterly. Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 322 E. 57th Street, New York, New York 10022.

Wilson Library Bulletin. H. W. Wilson Co., 950 University Avenue, Bronx, New York 10452.

Publishers magazines, e.g., *Scholastic Teacher, Words, The Teacher's Notebook, Exercise Exchange.*

VI. CURRICULUM MATERIAL

A. *Essential.*

Catalogs of available films and audiovisual aids

Cumulative records and standardized test scores on students (unless basic information is otherwise made available to classroom teacher. The maintenance of this file should be the responsibility of the departmental secretary)

Examination copies of textbooks and supplementary books available for classroom teaching

Teacher's manuals to accompany texts being used
File of departmental tests
Files of individual mimeographed exercises, and study aids
File of resource units developed in the school
Resources for the Teaching of English. National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61822.
Sample material from curriculum study centers of the U. S. Office of Education Program in English
Specimen sets of standardized tests in English
One hundred or more recordings selected for usefulness in teaching English from those records suggested in *Annotated List of Recordings in the Language Arts.* National Council of Teachers of English, 508 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, Ill. 61822.

B. *Desirable.*

List of kinescopes available from College Entrance Examination Board, Commission on English and other sources (Curriculum Study Center, "Camera Three," etc.)
Sample curricula from other schools
Samples of new textbooks and teaching materials being considered for departmental use
Sample textbooks used in English courses at neighboring colleges (rhetoric, composition, literature), e.g., McCrimmon, *Writing with a Purpose,* Houghton Mifflin Company; Brooks, Warren, and Purser, *Introduction to Literature,* Appleton-Century-Crofts; Wilson and Locke, *University Handbook,* Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

V. REFERENCE BOOKS

A. *Essential.*

Bartlett, John. *Familiar Quotations.* Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Company, 1955.
Gove, Philip B. (ed. in chief). *Webster's Third International Dictionary.* Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1955.
Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology.* Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown & Company, 1942. (Also New American Library of World Literature, Inc., paperback).
Roget, Peter Mark. *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases,* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1946 *or*
Cousins, Norman (ed.). *March's Thesaurus-Dictionary,* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958 *or*
Lewis, Norman (ed.). *Roget's Thesaurus in Dictionary Form.* New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1961.
A library of basic literary works for reading and reference. The collection might consist of 25 or more volumes and include standard

works in English and American literature (e.g., the *Bible*, the complete works of Shakespeare, *Oxford Book of English Verse*, a collection of modern American poetry, Gassner's *Treasury of the Theatre.)*

B. *Highly Recommended.* (A library of basic references)

Abrams, Meyer H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1957. (Revised edition paperback.)

Barnhart, Clarence L., and William D. Halsey. *The New Century Handbook of English Literature.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

————. *New Century Cyclopedia of Names*, 3 vol. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Beckson, Karl, and Arthur Ganz. *Reader's Guide to Literary Terms: A Dictionary.* New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, Inc., 1960 (Also paperback).

Thrall, William F., Addison Hibbard, Hugh Holman. *Handbook to Literature.* New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1960.

Bryant, Margaret, *Current American Usage.* New York: Funk & Wagnals Co., Inc., 1962.

Evans, Bergen and Cornelia: *A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1957.

Murray, James A. H., Henry Bradley, W. A. Craigie, C. T. Onions (eds.). *The Oxford English Dictionary Being a Corrected Re-Issue of a New English Dictionary.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Nicholson, Margaret. *A Dictionary of American English Usage.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Rodale, J. I. *Word Finder.* Emmaus, Pa.: Rodale Books, Inc., 1947.

Kunitz, Stanley J. (ed.). *Twentieth Century Authors: A Biographical Dictionary of Modern Literature.* Bronx, New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1955.

Leach, Maria (ed.), Jerome Fried (assoc. ed.). *Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend*, 2 vols. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., Inc., 1949-1951.

Peck, Harry T. (ed.). *Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities.* New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., n.d.

Richards, Robert L. *Dictionary of American Literature.* Paterson, N. J.: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1959. (Also paperback).

Smith, Horatio E. (ed.). *Columbia Dictionary of Modern European Literature.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1947.

Baugh, Albert C., and others. *Literary History of England.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1948.

Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*, 2 vols. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1960.

Harvey, Sir Paul (ed. and comp.). *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature.* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1937.

————. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Hart, James David (ed. and comp.). *The Oxford Companion to American Literature* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Spiller, Robert E., Willard Thorp, Thomas H. Johnson, Henry Seidel Canby (eds.). *Literary History of the United States,* revised edition in 1 vol. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953.

Trent, W. P., John Erskine, Stuart P. Sherman, Carl Van Doren (eds.). *Cambridge History of American Literature.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.

Ward, A. W., and A. R. Waller (eds.). *Cambridge History of English Literature.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

Baugh, Albert C. *History of the English Language* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Leary, Lewis (ed.). *Contemporary Literary Scholarship.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958.

C. *Desirable.*

Bridgewater, William, and Seymour Kurtz (eds.). *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (3rd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Cowie, Alexander. *The Rise of the American Novel.* New York: American Book Company, 1948.

Hansen, Harry (ed.). *World Almanac and Book of Facts* (1964 ed.). New York: Doubleday and Co., 1964.

Herzberg, Max J. *Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1962.

Hornstein, Lillian H., and others (eds.). *The Reader's Companion to World Literature.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1956. (Also New American Library Mentor paperback, 1956).

Johnson, Allen, and Dumas Malone. *Dictionary of American Biography* (rev. ed., Index & Supplement I). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943-1945. (Supplement 2, 1958).

Kunitz, Stanley J., and Howard Haycraft. *American Authors 1600-1900.* Bronx, N. Y.: H. W. Wilson Co., 1938.

Ravenal, William III. *An English Reference Book.* P. O. Box 3007, Alexandria, Va.

20 to 25 biographical and critical discusssions of major authors from such series as Twayne's editions. Twentieth Century Views, etc.

Selected casebooks of readings on works of literature frequently taught, e.g., *Huckleberry Finn, Lord Jim,* etc.

VI. BOOKS ON CURRICULUM AND METHOD

A. *Highly Recommended.*

Advanced Placement Program: Course Descriptions. Princeton, N.J.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1964. (Paperback).

Carruthers, Robert. *Building Better English Tests.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Committee on National Interest. *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

————. *The National Interest and Teaching of English.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961.

Gordon, Edward, and Edward S. Noyes (eds.). *Essays on the Teaching of English.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960.

Guth, Hans P. *English Today and Tomorrow. A Guide for Teachers of English.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Hook, J. N. *The Teaching of High School English* (rev. ed.). New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1965.

Loban, Walter, Margaret Ryan, James R. Squire. *Teaching Language and Literature.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961.

Sauer, Edwin H. *English in the Secondary School.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

B. *Desirable.*

Barnes, K. C. *Creative Imagination.* New York: Humanities Press, Inc.

Barzun, Jacques. *Teacher in America.* Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1945. (Also Doubleday Anchor Series paperback, 1954).

Bernstein, Abraham. *Teaching English in High School.* New York: Random House, 1962.

Bruner, Jerome. *Process of Education.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Commission on English. *End-of-the-Year Examinations in English.* Princeton, N.J.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963.

Harrison, George B. *Profession of English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962.

Highet, Gilbert. *The Art of Teaching.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950-51. (Also Vintage Press paperback).

Holbrook, David. *English for Maturity.* Cambridge, England: University Press, 1961.

————. *English for the Rejected.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Jewett, Arno. *English Language Arts in American High Schools.* Bulletin No. 13. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1958.

LaBrant, Lou. *We Teach English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1951.

Lewis, John S., and Jean C. Sisk. *Teaching English 7-12.* New York: American Book Company, 1963.

Lynch, James J., and Bertrand Evans. *High School English Textbooks.* Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown and Co., 1963.

Stone, George Winchester, Jr. (ed.). *Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Torrance, E. Paul. *Education and the Creative Potential.* Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

Weiss, M. Jerry. *An English Teacher's Reader.* New York: Odyssey Press, 1962.

Wolfe, Donald. *Creative Ways to Teach English in Grades 7 through 12.* New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1958.

Yale University. *Reports and Speeches of the Yale Conference on English.* New Haven, Conn.: Office of Teacher Training, Yale University.

VII. SELECTED BOOKS ON READING

Recommended.

American Library Association. *Doors to More Mature Reading.* Chicago, Ill.: American Library Association, 1964.

Bauman, Henry A., Ursula Hogan, Charles E. Green. *Reading Instruction in the Secondary School.* New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1961.

DeBoer, John J., and Martha Dallman. *The Teaching of Reading.* (rev. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Gans, Roma. *Common Sense in Teaching Reading.* Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1963.

Harris, Albert J. *How to Increase Reading Ability* (4th ed.). New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1961.

Judson, Horace, and Parker L. Coddington. *Techniques of Reading* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

Kottmeyer, William. *Handbook for Remedial Reading.* St. Louis, Mo.: Webster Publishing Co., 1959.

Simpson, Elizabeth A. *Helping High School Students Read Better.* Chicago, Ill.: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1954.

Strang, Ruth, Constance McCullough, Arthur Traxler. *Problems in the Improvement of Reading* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

————, and Dorothy Kendall Bracken. *Making Better Readers.* Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1957.

Selected publications on reading skills on various content areas, such as report of the National Council for the Social Studies.

VIII. SELECTED BOOKS ON COMPOSITION, SPEECH, AND RHETORIC

A. *Highly Recommended.*

- Brooks, Cleanth, and R. P. Warren. *Modern Rhetoric* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958.
- California Association of Teachers of English. *A Scale for Evaluating High School Student Essays.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1960.
- Judine, Sister M. *A Guide for Evaluating Student Composition.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.
- Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.
- Perrin, Porter G. *Writer's Guide and Index to English* (3rd ed.). Chicago, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1959.
- Strunk, William, Jr., and E. B. White. *The Elements of Style.* (rev. ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. (Also paperback).

B. *Desirable.*

- Beardsley, Monroe C. *Thinking Straight: Principles of Reasoning for Readers and Writers* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.
- Bennet, Robert A. (ed.). *Speech in the English Classroom, A Portfolio of Articles.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1962.
- Dent, John D. *Thought in English Prose.* New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., n.d.
- Ford, Boris. *Young Writers, Young Readers.* England: Hutchison of London, 1960.
- Gibson, Walker. *Seeing and Writing.* New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1959. (Also paperback).
- Graves, Harold F., and Bernard S. Oldsey. *From Fact to Judgment* (2nd ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.
- Hook, J. N. *Guide to Good Writing.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1962.
- ——————. *Writing Creatively.* Boston, Mass.: D. C. Heath & Co. 1963.
- Johnson, Ray I., and others. *Communication: Handling Ideas Effectively.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Martin, Harold C. and Richard Ohmann. *The Logic and Rhetoric of Exposition* (rev. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1963.

Mathieu, Aron (ed.). *Creative Writer*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Writer's Digest, n.d.

Mearns, Hughes. *Creative Power*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958.

Ostrom, John. *Better Paragraphs*. San Francisco, Calif.: Chandler Publishing Co., 1961.

Roberts, Edgar V. *Writing Themes About Literature*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Sherwood, John C. *Discourse of Reason* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964. (Also paperback).

Ward, William S. (ed.). "Principles and Standards in Composition for Kentucky High Schools," *Kentucky English Bulletin*, Fall, 1956-57.

IX. SELECTED BOOKS ON LITERATURE

A. *Highly Recommended.*

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brooks, Cleanth, and Robert Penn Warren. *Understanding Fiction*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960.

————. *Understanding Poetry* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960.

Ciardi, John. *How Does a Poem Mean?* Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Drew, Elizabeth. *Discovering Poetry*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1933.

————. *Novel: A Modern Guide to Fifteen English Masterpieces*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., n.d.

————. *Poetry: A Modern Guide to Its Understanding and Enjoyment*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1959.

Perrine, Laurence. *Sound and Sense: An Introduction to Poetry* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., n.d.

Ryan, Margaret. *Teaching the Novel in Paperback*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

B. *Desirable.*

Altick, Richard. *Preface to Critical Reading* (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960.

Bacon, Wallace A., and Robert S. Breen (eds.). *Literature for Interpretation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Briggs, Thomas. *Poetry and Its Enjoyment*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1957.

Burton, Dwight L. *Literature Study in the High School* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Cane, Melville. *Making a Poem.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., n.d. (Also Harvest paperback).

Chase, Richard. *The American Novel and Its Tradition.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957. (Also Doubleday Anchor paperback).

Deutsch, Babette. *Poetry Handbook: A Dictionary of Terms.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., Inc., 1962.

Eisinger, Chester E. *Fiction of the Forties.* Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Fadiman, Clifton. *Lifetime Reading Plan.* Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, 1960.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Geiger, Don. *The Sound, Sense, and Performance of Literature.* Chicago, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1963.

Hamilton, Edith. *The Greek Way.* New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1930.

Millett, Fred B. *Reading Drama.* New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950. (Also *Reading Fiction* and *Reading Poetry*).

Reeves, Ruth, and Shirley Wiley. *Understanding the Novel, Books I and II.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1962.

Reid, James M. *Poetry—A Closer Look.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

Richards, I. A. *Practical Criticism.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1939.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. *Literature as Exploration.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1938.

Ross, Ralph G., and others. *Arts of Reading.* New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1960.

Snell, George. *Shapers of American Fiction.* New York: Cooper Square Publishers, n.d.

Thorpe, James (ed.). *The Aims and Methods of Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literature.* New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1963.

Wagenknecht, Edward. *Cavalcade of the American Novel.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1952.

————. *Cavalcade of the English Novel* (rev. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1954.

Wheelock, John Hall. *What Is Poetry.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.

Yasuda, Kenneth. *The Japanese Haiku: Essential Nature, History and Possibilities in English.* Rutland, Vt.: Charles E. Tuttle Co., n.d.

X. SPECIALIZED BOOKS ON LANGUAGE

A. *Highly Recommended.*

Allen, Harold B. (ed.). *Readings in Applied English Linguistics* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Francis, W. Nelson. *The Structure of American English.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1958.

Fries, C. C. *American English Grammar.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940.

Hayakawa, S. I. *Language in Thought and Action.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Jespersen, Otto. *The Growth and Structure of the English Language.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1955. (Also Doubleday Anchor paperback).

Mencken, H. L. *The American Language* (4th ed. and 2 supplements abridged by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Roberts, Paul. *English Sentences.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1962.

——————. *English Syntax.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

——————. *Patterns of English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1956.

Sapir, Edward. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1921. (Also a Harvest Book paperback).

B. *Desirable.*

Anderson, W. L., and N. C. Stageberg. *Introductory Readings on Languages.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.

Bloomfield, Morton, and Leonard Newmark. *A Linguistic Introduction to the History of English.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.

Dean, Leonard F., and Kenneth G. Wilson. *Essays on Language and Usage* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Gleason, H. A., Jr. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics* (rev. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Hall, Robert A., Jr. *Linguistics and Your Language.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, n.d. (Also Doubleday Anchor paperback).

Hughes, John P. *The Science of Language.* New York: Random House, 1961.

Laird, Charlton M. *Thinking About Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960. (Paperback).

Malmstrom, Jean, and Annabel Ashley. *Dialects U. S. A.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Muinzer, Louis. "Historical Linguistics in the Classroom," *Illinois English Bulletin,* November 1960. (Distributed by the National Council of Teachers of English).

Pooley, Robert C. *Teaching English Grammar.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

———. *Teaching English Usage.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Rycenga, John A., and J. Schwartz. *Perspectives on Language.* New York; The Ronald Press Company, 1963.

Sledd, James. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar.* Chicago, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1959.

Thomas, Cleveland A. *Language Power for Youth.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955.

Ullman, Stephen. *Semantics: Introduction to the Science of Meaning.* New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1962.

Whitehall, Harold. *Structural Essentials of English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1956.

XI. SPECIALIZED BOOKS ON THE MASS MEDIA

A. *Highly Recommended.*

Boutwell, William D. (ed.). *Using Mass Media in the Schools.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.

Sheridan, Marion C., Harold Owen, Ken Macrorie, Fred Marcus. *The Motion Picture and the Teaching of English.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

B. *Desirable.*

Butman, Alexander, Donald Reis, David Sohn. *Paperbacks in the Schools.* New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1963 (Paperback).

O'Hara, Robert C. *Media for the Millions.* New York: Random House, 1961.

Postman, Neil, and the Committee on the Study of Television. *Television and the Teaching of English.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Wood, James P. *Magazines in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956.

XII. AIDS FOR SELECTING BOOKS FOR ADOLESCENTS

A. *Highly Recommended.*

Alm, Richard (ed.). *Books for You.* New York: Washington Square Press, 1964.

A Basic Book Collection for High Schools (periodically revised). Chicago, Ill.: American Library Association.

Lueders, Edward (ed.). *College and Adult Reading List of Books in Literature and the Fine Arts.* New York: Washington Square Press, 1962.

Weber, Sherwood. *Good Reading.* New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1960. (Also New American Library of World Literature paperback).

B. *Desirable.*

A Basic Book Collection for Junior High Schools (periodically revised). Chicago, Ill.: American Library Association.

The Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin. Chicago, Ill.: American Library Association.

Books for the Teen Age (issued annually). New York: New York Public Library.

Crosby, Muriel (ed.). *Reading Ladders for Human Relations* (4th ed.). Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1963.

Your Reading: A Book List for Junior High School (periodically revised). Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Appendix C

Citizen's Request for Reconsideration of a Book[1]

Author **Hardcover** **Paperback**

Title

Publisher (if known)

Request initiated by____

Telephone__________________________ **Address**______________

City______________________________ **Zip Code**______________

Complainant represents

____**himself**

____**(name organization)**__________________________________

____**(identify other group)**________________________________

1. To what in the book do you object? (Please be specific; cite pages.)

____

____

2. What do you feel might be the result of reading this book?__________

____

____

3. For what age group would you recommend this book?______________

____

____

4. Is there anything good about this book?________________________

____

____

---

[1] Committee on the Right to Read, *The Students' Right to Read* (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1962), p. 17.

5. Did you read the entire book?__________What parts?____________________

____

____

6. Are you aware of the judgment of this book by literary critics?____________

____

7. What do you believe is the theme of this book?_______________________

____

8. What would you like your school to do about this book?
________do not assign it to my child
________withdraw it from all students as well as from my child
________send it back to the English department office for reevaluation

9. In its place what book of equal literary quality would you recommend that would convey as valuable a picture and perspective of our civilization?________

____

____
Signature of Complainant

6

Appendix D

Participants at the First Conference on the Organization, Administration, and Supervision of High School Departments of English

URBANA, ILLINOIS
OCTOBER 15-17, 1964

PROJECT STAFF:

James R. Squire, *Director*

Roger K. Applebee, *Associate Director*

Robert J. Lacampagne, *Editor and Administrative Assistant*

Joseph W. Thomson

Robert A. Lucas

Robert A. Bennett
San Diego City Schools
San Diego, California

Sue M. Brett
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Mabel Brown
Reno High School
Reno, Nevada

Margaret Casey
Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School
Bethesda, Maryland

Mrs. Jean L. B. Christison
Rincon High School
Tucson, Arizona

Evelyn M. Copeland
Fairfield Public Schools
Fairfield, Connecticut

Richard Corbin
Hunter College High School
New York, New York

Clarence W. Hach
Evanston Township High School
Evanston, Illinois

Travis E. Harris
Manhasset High School
Manhasset, L. I., New York

Mrs. Ruth Herin
Broad Ripple High School
Indianapolis, Ind.

Josephine Martin
Pine Bluff High School
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

Henry C. Meckel
San Jose State College
San Jose, California

Frank Rice
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Floyd Rinker
Commission on English
Boston, Massachusetts

Charles B. Ruggless
Phoenix Union High School System
Phoenix, Arizona

Leo Ruth
University of California
Berkeley, California

Nicholas Schreiber
Ann Arbor High School
Ann Arbor, Michigan

William See
Jefferson High School
Portland, Oregon

Mrs. Nell H. Thomas
Greenville High School
Greenville, Mississippi

Participants at the Second Conference on the Organization, Administration, and Supervision of High School Departments of English

CLEVELAND, OHIO
NOVEMBER 25, 1964

PROJECT STAFF:

James R. Squire, *Director*
Roger K. Applebee, *Associate Director*
Robert J. Lacampagne, *Editor and Administrative Assistant*
Robert A. Lucas
Joseph W. Thomson

CONSULTANTS AT LARGE:

Lou LaBrant, Dillard University, New Orleans, Louisiana
Floyd Rinker, Executive Director, Commission on English, Boston, Massachusetts

RESOURCE SPECIALISTS:

Robert A. Bennett, San Diego City Schools, San Diego, California
Sue Brett, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
Sister Philippa Coogan, Holy Angels Academy, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Richard Corbin, Hunter College High School, New York, New York
John J. DeBoer, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois
Lloyd Dull, Canton Public Schools, Canton, Ohio
Leo Ruth, University of California, Berkeley, California
Edwin H. Sauer, Chicago Teachers College South, Chicago, Illinois

CHAIRMEN:

Mabel M. Brown, Reno High School, Reno, Nevada[1]
Margaret M. Casey, Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, Bethesda, Maryland
Clarence W. Hach, Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois

---

[1] All chairmen and participants are English Department Chairmen unless otherwise noted.

Travis E. Harris, Manhasset High School, Manhasset, L. I., New York

Ruth B. Herin, Broad Ripple High School, Indianapolis, Indiana

Frank M. Rice, Codirector of the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska

Charles B. Ruggless, Consultant in English, Phoenix Union High School System, Phoenix, Arizona

Nell H. Thomas, Greenville High School, Greenville, Mississippi

Mrs. Genella Allison
Claremont Central High School
Hickory, North Carolina

Mrs. Isabella Bjerring
Thomas Jefferson Senior High School
Port Arthur, Texas

Catherine A. Collins
East High School
Salt Lake City, Utah

Mrs. Jane Martin Cushman
Hollywood High School
Los Angeles, California

Mrs. Verna Deimer
Rapid City High School
Rapid City, South Dakota

Mrs. Mildred G. Dunham
Penn Hills Senior High School
Penn Hills, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Ruth J. Evans
Fairmont West High School
Kettering, Ohio

Mrs. Winifred Farrar
Meridian High School
Meridian, Mississippi

Frances F. Feris
Natrona County High School
Casper, Wyoming

Mildred Foster
Shortridge High School
Indianapolis, Indiana

Josephine Frisbie
Central High School
Omaha, Nebraska

Ron Gersmehl
South Side High School
Fort Wayne, Indiana

Mrs. Ruth S. Gibson
Bellevue Senior High School
Bellevue, Washington

Howard B. Goodrich
Catonsville Senior High School
Catonsville, Maryland

William R. Hampton
McCluer High School
Florissant, Missouri

Elizabeth Herbert
John R. Rogers High School
Spokane, Washington

Charles H. Hohner
Cooley High School
Detroit, Michigan

Laura Johnston
Sidney Lanier High School
Montgomery, Alabama

Margaret J. Kauffman
Walter Johnson High School
Bethesda, Maryland

Mrs. Grace Knaggs
Assistant Principal
Devilbiss High School
Toledo, Ohio
(Formerly Deparment Chairman)

Mary Knight
Granby High School
Norfolk, Virginia

John F. Lincks
John Marshall High School
Cleveland, Ohio

Lucille Lundgren
Ann Arbor High School
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Richard A. McLaughlin
Amherst Senior High School
Snyder, New York

Mrs. Mildred Miller
Stranahan High School
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Dorothy A. Nelson
Washington-Lee High School
Arlington, Virginia

Mrs. Iris Nordberg
El Camino High School
Sacramento, California

Mrs. Nora B. Nunnally
Sandia High School
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Ellen O'Drain
Thomas Carr Howe High School
Indianapolis, Indiana

Margaret L. Oechsner
John R. Buchtel Senior High School
Akron, Ohio

William E. Otto
East High School
Green Bay, Wisconsin

Mrs. Inez O. Parker
Bolton High School
Alexandria, Louisiana

Harry E. Parratt
Arvada West High School
Arvada, Colorado

Cramer Percival
Bloomfield Hills High School
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Harold J. Perry
Director of Curriculum
Highland Park and Deerfield
High Schools
(Formerly Department Chairman,
Highland Park)

R. Stanley Peterson
New Trier Township High School
Winnetka, Illinois

Mrs. Betty Porter
MacArthur High School
San Antonio, Texas

Mrs. Louis Askew Rauscher
Central High School
Memphis, Tennessee

Harold P. Resh
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute
Baltimore, Maryland

Irene Rhodes
Arsenal Technical High School
Indianapolis, Indiana

John C. Sanders
Danville Senior High School
Danville, Illinois

Kenneth E. Schomborg
Mount Pleasant High School
Wilmington, Delaware

Nicholas Schreiber, Principal
Ann Arbor High School
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Richard Schurr
John Adams High School
South Bend, Indiana

William See
Jefferson High School
Portland, Oregon

Edward R. Seltzer
Abington High School, South Campus
Abington, Pennsylvania

Marian Shakespear
Bryce Valley High School
Tropic, Utah

Helen Shipman
Normandy Senior High School
St. Louis, Missouri

Mrs. Berniece Shrader
Talawanda High School
Oxford, Ohio

George G. Starr
Shaker Heights High School
Cleveland, Ohio

Norman L. Stewart
Eisenhower High School
Decatur, Illinois

Mrs. Arabelle Stubbe
Mira Costa High School
Manhattan Beach, California

Myrtle Tanner
Greenville Senior High School
Greenville, South Carolina

Mrs. Gladys Veidemanis
Oshkosh High School
Oshkosh, Wisconsin

Mrs. Kathleen T. Vinson
Robert E. Lee High School
Jacksonville, Florida

Frances E. Wallingford
Wasson High School
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Mrs. Shirley W. Wiley
Bellaire Senior High School
Houston, Texas

Trask H. Wilkinson
Brookline High School
Brookline, Massachusetts

Charles G. Will
Upper Arlington High School
Columbus, Ohio

Mrs. Mary Joan Woods
Dearborn High School
Dearborn, Michigan

Seymour Yesner
North High School
Minneapolis, Minnesota